arXiv:0901.0143v2 [math.DG] 6 Jan 2009

The Atiyah Patodi Singer signature formula for measured foliations

Paolo Antonini
antonini@mat.uniroma1.it
paolo.anton@gmail.com

January 6, 2009

Abstract

Let $(X_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$ be a compact manifold with boundary endowed with a foliation $\mathcal{F}_0$ which is assumed to be measured and transverse to the boundary. We denote by Λ a holonomy invariant transverse measure on $(X_0, \mathcal{F}_0)$ and by $\mathcal{R}_0$ the equivalence relation of the foliation. Let $(X, \mathcal{F})$ be the corresponding manifold with cylindrical end and extended foliation with equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$.
In the first part of this work we prove a formula for the L^2-Λ index of a longitudinal Dirac-type operator $D^{\mathcal{F}}$ on X in the spirit of Alain Connes' non commutative geometry [26]

$$\operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^{\mathcal{F},+}) = \langle \hat{A}(T\mathcal{F}) \operatorname{Ch}(E/S), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) - h^+_\Lambda + h^-_\Lambda].$$

In the second part we specialize to the signature operator. We define three types of signature for the pair (foliation, boundary foliation): the analytic signature, denoted $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X, \partial X_0)$ is the L^2-Λ-index of the signature operator on the cylinder; the Hodge signature $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{Hodge}}(X, \partial X_0)$, defined using the natural representation of $\mathcal{R}$ on the field of square integrable harmonic forms on the leaves and the de Rham signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{dR}}(X, \partial X_0)$, defined using the natural representation of $\mathcal{R}_0$ on the field of relative de Rham spaces of the leaves. We prove that these three signatures coincide

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{Hodge}}(X, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{dR}}(X, \partial X_0).$$

As a consequence of these equalities and of the index formula we finally obtain the main result of this work, the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer signature formula for measured foliations:

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{dR}}(X, \partial X_0) = \langle L(T\mathcal{F}_0), C_\Lambda \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})]$$

Contents

1 Introduction **2**

2 Geometric Setting **13**
2.1 Holonomy 13
2.2 Longitudinal Dirac operator 15

3 The Atiyah Patodi Singer index theorem **16**

4 Von Neumann algebras, foliations and index theory **18**
4.1 Non–commutative integration theory. 18
4.2 Holonomy invariant transverse measures 27
4.2.1 Measures and currents 28

4.2.2 Tangential cohomology 31
4.2.3 Transverse measures and non commutative integration theory 32
4.3 Von Neumann algebras and Breuer Fredholm theory for foliations 33
4.3.1 The splitting principle 37

5 Analysis of the Dirac operator 39
5.1 Finite dimensionality of the index problem 39
5.2 Breuer–Fredholm perturbation 44

6 Cylindrical finite propagation speed and Cheeger Gromov Taylor type estimates. 49
6.1 The standard case 49
6.2 The cylindrical case 55

7 The eta invariant 58
7.1 The classical eta invariant 58
7.2 The foliation case 59
7.3 Eta invariant for perturbations of the Dirac operator 62

8 The index formula 63

9 Comparison with Ramachandran index formula 72
9.1 The Ramachandran index 72

10 The signature of a foliated manifold with boundary 76
10.1 The Hirzebruch formula 76
10.2 Computations with the leafwise signature operator 78
10.3 The Analytic signature 79
10.4 The Hodge signature 83
10.5 Analytical signature=Hodge signature 83
10.6 The L^2–de Rham signature 84
10.6.1 manifolds with boundary with bounded geometry 84
10.6.2 Random Hilbert complexes 86
10.6.3 Definition of the de Rham signature 88
10.7 L^2 de Rham signature=Harmonic signature 88
10.7.1 The boundary foliation and $\mathcal{R}_0$ 89
10.7.2 Weakly exact sequences 92
10.7.3 Spectral density functions and Fredholm complexes. 94
10.7.4 The proof 100

A Analysis on Manifolds with bounded geometry 105
A.1 Spectral functions of elliptic operators 107
A.2 Some computations on Clifford algebras 109

1 Introduction

Let X_0 be a $4k$–dimensional oriented manifold without boundary. One can give four different definitions of the signature.

- The topological signature $\sigma(X_0)$ is defined as the signature of the intersection form in the middle degree cohomology; $(x, y) := \langle x \cup y, [X_0] \rangle$, $x, y \in \mathrm{H}^{2k}(X_0, \mathbb{R})$.
- The de Rham signature $\sigma_{\mathrm{dR}}(X_0)$ is the signature of the Poincaré intersection form in the middle de Rham cohomology; $([\omega], [\phi]) := \int_{X_0} \omega \wedge \phi$; $\omega, \phi \in \mathrm{H}^{2k}_{dR}(X_0)$.

- The Hodge signature, $\sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0)$ is the signature of the Poincaré intersection form defined in the space of $2k$ Harmonic forms with respect to some choosen Riemannian structure $(\omega, \phi) := \int_{X_0} \omega \wedge \phi;\ \omega, \phi \in \mathcal{H}^{2k}(X_0)$.
- The analytical signature is the index of the chiral signature operator[1]

$$\sigma_{\text{an}}(X_0) := \operatorname{ind}(D^{\text{sign},+}).$$

One can prove that all these numbers coincide,

$$\sigma(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{dR}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{Hodge}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\text{an}}(X_0). \tag{1}$$

The Hirzebruch formula

$$\sigma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0)$$

can be proven using cobordism arguments as in the original work of Hirzebruch or can be seen as a consequence of the Atiyah–Singer index formula [10] and the chain of equalities (1).

If $\widetilde{X_0} \longrightarrow X_0$ is a Galois covering with deck group Γ with X_0 as above Atiyah [2] used the Von Neumann algebra associated to the regular right representation of Γ to normalize the signature on L^2 middle degree harmonic forms on the total space. This signature $\sigma_\Gamma(X_0)$ again enters in a Hirzebruch type formula

$$\sigma_\Gamma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0).$$

This is the celebrated Atiyah L^2–signature theorem.

The Atiyah L^2–signature theorem was extended by Alain Connes [26] to the situation in which the total space X_0 is foliated by an even dimensional foliation. This is the realm of *non–commutative geometry*. We shall have the occasion to describe extensively this kind of result.

What can one say if X_0 has non empty boundary ?

So let now X_0 be an oriented compact manifold with boundary and suppose the metric is product type near the boundary. Attach an infinite cylinder across the boundary to form the manifold with cylindrical ends,

$$X = X_0 \bigcup_{\partial X_0} \Big[\partial X_0 \times [0, \infty) \Big]$$

In the seminal paper by Atiyah Patodi and Singer [5] is showen that the Fredholm index of the generalized boundary value problem with the pseudodifferential APS boundary condition on X_0 for the signature operator (or a chiral Dirac type operator) is connected to the L^2–index of the extended operator on X. Indeed this Fredholm index is the L^2 index on X plus a defect depending on the space of extended solutions on the cylinder. More precisely the operator on the cylinder acting on the natural space of L^2–sections is no more Fredholm (in the general case in which the boundary operator is not invertible) but its kernel and the kernel of its formal adjoint are finite dimensional and this difference is given by the formula[2]

---

[1] this is the differential operator $d + d^*$ acting on the complex of differential forms, odd w.r.t. the natural chiral grading $\tau := (-1)^k * (-1)^{\frac{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)}{2}}$, $D^{\text{sign}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^{\text{sign},-} \\ D^{\text{sign},+} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

$$\operatorname{ind}_{L^2}(D^+) = \int_{X_0} \hat{A}(X,\nabla)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E) + \frac{\eta(0)}{2} + \frac{h_\infty(D^-) - h_\infty(D^+)}{2};$$

where $h_\infty(D^\pm)$ are the dimensions of the limiting values of the extended L^2 solutions and $\eta(0)$ is the eta invariant of the boundary operator.
Then, in the case of the signature operator, in dimension $4k$ the authors investigate the relationship between the APS index of the operator on X_0, the signature of the pair $(X_0, \partial X_0)$, the L^2 index on X and the space of harmonic forms on X. The conclusion is that the signature $\sigma(X_0)$ is exactly the L^2–index on the cylinder i.e. the difference of the dimensions $h^\pm$ of positive/negative square integrable harmonic forms[3] on X,

$$\sigma(X_0) = h^+ - h^- = \operatorname{ind}_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},+})$$

while $h_\infty(D^{\mathrm{sign},-}) = h_\infty(D^{\mathrm{sign},+})$ by specific simmetries of the signature operator. In particular the APS signature formula becomes

$$\sigma(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0,\nabla) + \eta\big(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{|\partial X_0}\big).$$

In the case of Γ–Galois coverings of a manifold with boundary with a cylinder attached, $\widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ this program is partially carried on by Vaillant [93] in his Master thesis. More specifically he estabilishes a Von Neumann index formula in the sense of Atiyah [2] for a Dirac type operator and relates this index with the Γ–dimensions of the harmonic forms on the total space. The remaining part of the story i.e. the relation with the topologically defined L^2–signature is carried out by Lück and Schick [60]. Call the index of Vaillant the analytical L^2–signature of the compact piece X_0, in symbols $\sigma_{\mathrm{an},(2)}(X_0)$ while Harmonic $\sigma_{Ho}(X_0)$ is the L^2 signature defined using harmonic forms on $\tilde{X}$. Then Vaillant proves that

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{an},(2)}(X_0) = \int_{X_0} L(X_0,\nabla) + \eta_\Gamma\big(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{|\partial\tilde{X}}\big) = \sigma_{\mathrm{Hodge}}(X_0).$$

Luck and Schick define other different types of L^2 signatures, de Rham $\sigma_{\mathrm{dR},(2)}(X_0)$ and simplicial $\sigma_{\mathrm{top},(2)}(X_0)$ and prove that they are all the same and coincide with the signatures of Vaillant. To be more precise they prove

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{Hodge}}(X_0) = \sigma_{\mathrm{dR},(2)}(X_0) = \sigma_{\mathrm{top},(2)}(X_0).$$

None of these steps are easy adaptations of the closed case since in the classical proof a fundamental role is played by the existence of a gap around the zero in the spectrum of the boundary operator. This situation fails to be true in non compact (also cocompact) ambients.

I this thesis I carry out this program for a foliated manifold with cylindrical ends endowed with a holonomy invariant measure Λ [26]. The framework is that explained by Connes in his seminal paper on non commutative integration theory [26] in particular I use in a crucial way the semifinite Von Neumann algebras associated to a measured foliation. Working with the Borel groupoid defined by the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ I first extend the index formula of Vaillant.

---

[2] opposite orientation w.r.t. APS

[3] indeed the intersection form is passes to be non–degenerate to the image of the relative cohomology into the absolute one. This vector space is naturally isomorphic to the space of L^2–harmonic forms on X.

Theorem 1.0 — The Dirac operator has finite dimensional $L^2 - \Lambda$–index and the following formula holds

$$\operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) - h^+_\Lambda + h^-_\Lambda]. \tag{2}$$

The dimensions of the spaces of extended solutions, $h^\pm_\Lambda$ are suitably defined using Von Neumann algebras associated to square integrable representations of $\mathcal{R}$, the foliation eta invariant is defined by Ramachandran [76] and the usual integral in the APS formula is changed into the distributional pairing with a tangential distributional form with the Ruelle–Sullivan current [65]. In the proof of (81) a significative role is played by the introduction of a notion of Λ–essential spectrum of an operator, relative to the trace defined by Λ in the leafwise Von Neumann algebra of the foliation. This is stable by Λ–compact perturbations (in the sense of Breuer [17]) and translate to the foliation contest the general philosophy of Melrose [62] stating that the operator is Fredholm iff is invertible at the boundary. Then we define a two parameter perturbation with invertible family at the boundary. This is a Breuer–Fredholm perturbation. The strategy is to prove first the formula for the perturbation then let the parameters go to zero.

In the second part, inspired by the definitions of Lück and Schick [60] I pass to the study of three different representations of $\mathcal{R}_0$ (the equivalence relation of the foliation on the compact piece X_0) in order to define the Analytical Signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (i.e. the measured index of the signature operator on the cylinder), the de Rham signature $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{dR}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (i.e the one induced by the representation which is valued in the relative de Rham spaces of the leaves) and the Hodge signature, $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{Hodge}}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ (defined in terms of the representation of $\mathcal{R}_0$ in the harmonic forms on the leaves of the foliation on X).
Combining a generalization of the notion of the L^2 long exact sequence of the pair (foliation,boundary foliation), in the sense of sequences of Random Hilbert complexes (the analog of the homology L^2 long sequence of Hilbert Γ–modules in Cheeger and Gromov [22]) together with the analysis of boundary value problems of [87], one shows that the methods in [60] can be generalized and give the following

Theorem 1.0 — The above three notions of Λ–signature for the foliation on X_0 coincide,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{dR}}(X, X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{Hodge}}(X, X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X, X_0)$$

and the following APS signature formula holds true

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})]$$

A more detailed description of the various sections follows.

Geometric setting
In this section the whole geometric structure is introduced. We speak about cylindrical foliations and all the data needed to define the longitudinal Dirac operator associated to a Clifford bundle. Every cylindrical foliation arises from a gluing process, starting from a foliated manifold with boundary and foliation transverse to the boundary. The first geometrical invariant of a foliation is its holonomy. It enters into index theory in an essential way providing a natural desingularization of the leaf space. The various holonomy covers glue all together into a manifold, the holonomy groupoid G where one can speak about smooth functions and apply

the usual analytical techniques. Following Ramachandran we work at level of the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ of being on the same leaf. This is the most elementary level of desingularization where boundary value problems can be set up without ambiguity.

Von Neumann algebras, foliations and index theory

Von Neumann algebras and Breuer Fredholm theory with traces. In this section generalities about Von Neumann algebras are given. These are particular $*$–subalgebras of all bounded operators acting on an Hilbert space. We specialize to Von Neumann algebras that can be equipped with a semi–finite normal faithful trace like Von Neumann algebras arising from foliations admitting a holonomy invariant transverse measure. Indeed Connes [27] has shown that holonomy invariant transverse measure correspond one to one to semifinite normal faithful traces on the Von Neumann algebra of the foliation. More generally a transverse measure gives a weight. This weight is invariant under interior automorphisms, i.e. is a trace, iff the measure is invariant under holonomy. Then in some sense holonomy is represented in the Von Neumann algebra by the interior automorphisms. One can also use the language of foliated current. A transverse measure selects a transverse current. This current is closed iff the transverse measure is hol. invariant.

So let M be a Von Neumann agebra with a trace $\tau : M^+ \longrightarrow [0, \infty]$ one has a natural notion of dimension of a closed subspace affiliated to M, i.e. a subspace V whose projection Pr_V belongs to M. This is by definition the relative dimension $\tau(\mathrm{Pr}_V)$. Relative dimension is the cornerstone of a theory of Fredholm operators inside M. This story goes back to the seminal work of Breuer [16, 17]. For this reason relatively Fredholm operators are called Breuer–Fredholm. A Breuer–Fredholm operator has a finite real index with some stability properties as in the classical theory.

Transverse measures and Von Neumann algebras.
In the spirit of Alain Connes non commutative geometry Von Neumann algebras stand for measure spaces while C^*–algebras describes topological spaces. In the seminal work [26] he has shown that a foliation with a given transverse measure gives rise to a Von Neumann algebra whose properties reflect the properties of the measure. First we define transverse measures as measures on the sigma ring of all Borel transversals. This is acted by the holonomy pseudogroup. When the measure is invariant w.r.t. this action one has a holonomy invariant measures.

If a holonomy invariant measure exists then the associated W^*– algebra is type I or type II (the first type appears only in the ergodic case). In particular there's a natural trace whose definition is explicitly given as an integral of suitable objects living along leaves against the transverse measure.

Then transverse measures can be considered as some kind of measure on the space of the leaves.

In this section we define the Von Neumann algebra associated to the transverse measure and a square representation of the Borel equivalence relation $x\mathcal{R}y$ iff x and y are in the same leave. For a vector bundle E this is the algebra of uniformly bounded fields of operators $x \longmapsto A_x : L^2(L_x; E) \longrightarrow L^2(L_x; E)$ (L_x is the leave of x) acting on the Borel field of Hilbert spaces $x \longmapsto L^2(X; E)$ suitably identified using the transverse measure. Thinking of an operator as a family of leafwise operators the trace has a natural meaning, it is the integral against the transverse measure of a family of leafwise measures called local traces.

For self adjoint intertwining operators, using the spectral theorem and the trace on M (coming from a transverse measure Λ) one can define a measure on $\mathbb{R}$ called the spectral measure (depending on the trace). Breuer–Fredholm properties of the operator are easily described in terms of this spectral measure. In particular one can define some kind of essential spectrum called the Λ–essential spectrum. Belonging of zero to the essential spectrum is equivalent for the operator to be Breuer–Fredholm. We show also that for elliptic operators the essential spectrum is governed by the behavior of the operator outside compact subsets on the ambient manifold. Notice that if one fix a compact set K on X every leaf can intersect K infinitely many times then our notion of "lying outside K" must be explained with care. We call this result the Splitting principle. It will be useful in the study of the Dirac operator.

Analysis of the Dirac operator. Consider the leafwise Dirac operator on X associated to the geometric datas of the first section. This is obtained from the collection of all Dirac operators $\{D_x\}_x$ one for each leave L_x. If the foliation is assumed even dimensional this is $\mathbb{Z}_2$–graded $D = D^+ \oplus D^-$ with respect to a natural involution on the bundle E. This is called the Chiral Dirac operator.

This leafwise family of operators gives an operator affiliated to the Von Neumann algebra M (the transverse measure gives the glue to join all the operators together). In particular each spectral projection of D defines a projection in M. If the foliated manifold is compact Connes han shown that this is a Breuer–Fredholm operator and the index, the relative dimension of Kernel minus CoKernel is related to topological invariants of the foliation by the Connes index formula.

$$\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^+) = \langle \operatorname{Ch}(D^+)\operatorname{Td}(X), [C_\Lambda] \rangle$$

On the right handside one finds the distributional coupling between a longitudinal characteristic class and the homology class of a closed current C_Λ associated to the transverse measure by the Ruelle–Sullivan method.

Finite dimensionality of the index problem.

In our cylindrical case, the operator is in general non Breuer–Fredholm. As a general philosophical principle for manifolds with cylindrical ends and product–structure operators, Fredholm properties of the operator on the natural L^2 space are essentially captured by the spectrum at zero of the operator on the cross section (the base of the cylinder). Thanks to the splitting principle the Philosophy

$$\text{invertibility at boundary} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \text{Freholm property}$$

carries on to the foliated case if one looks at the Λ–essential spectrum of the leafwise operator on the foliation induced on the transverse section of the cylinder (this is to be thought of as the foliation at infinity).

Now it's a well known fact that lots of Dirac type operators of capital importance in Physics and Geometry are not invertible at the boundary (infinity). One example for all is the Signature operator, our main application here.

However some work on elliptic regularity and the use of the generalized eigenfunction expansion of Browder and Gårding shows that the Λ–dimension of the projection on the L^2 kernel of D^+ and D^- are finite projections of the V.N. algebra M. In particular we can define the L^2 chiral index of D^+ as

$$\operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) = \dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+) - \dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^-).$$

On a compact foliated manifold, if a family of operators is implemented by a family of leafwise uniformly smoothing schwartz kernels the finite trace property follows immediately from the remarkable fact that integrating a longitudinal Radon measure against a transverse measure gives a finite mass measure on the ambient. Now the ambient is a manifold with a cylinder, hence Radon longitudinal measures do not give finite measures in general. Our strategy to prove the finite dimensionality of the L^2 index problem is to show that the field of L^2

projections on the kernel of D^+_x enjoys the additional property to be locally traceable with respect to a bigger family of Borel sets. To be more precise we prove that for every compact set K on the boundary of the cylinder of a leave the operator $\chi_{K\times\mathbb{R}^+}\Pi_{\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)}\chi_{K\times\mathbb{R}^+}$ is trace class on $L^2(L_x)$. This is sufficient (by the integration process) to assure finite dimensionality.

Breuer–Fredholm perturbation.
Once finite dimensionality of kernels is proven we perform a perturbation argument to change the Dirac operator into a Breuer–Fredholm one. This is done following very closely Boris Vaillant paper [?] where the same problem is studied for Galois coverings of manifolds with cylindrical ends. Since we are working with Von Neumann algebras the possibilty to use Borel functional calculus gives a great help in a way that we can define our two parameters perturbation essentially by boundary operator minus the boundary operator restricted to some small spectral interval near zero

$$D \rightsquigarrow D_{\epsilon,u}, \quad D_{\epsilon,0} := D_\epsilon$$

Next we prove (through the splitting principle) that $D_{\epsilon,u}$ is Breuer–Fredholm for small parameters and its index approximates the chiral index. Actually we have to consider separately the two parameters limits.
The analysis of the relation between the perturbed Fredholm index and the chiral L^2 index requires the introduction of weighted L^2 spaces along the leaves, $e^{u\theta}L^2$ for $u > 0$ (r is the cylindrical coordinate). Smooth solutions belonging to each weighted space are called Extended Solutions, $\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm)$. They enter naturally into the A.P.S index formula but do not form a closed subspace in L^2. Some care is needed in defining their Λ–dimension and prove that this is finite.
The remaining part of the section is devoted to the proof of the fundamental asymptotic relations

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+_\epsilon) = \mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+), \qquad \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_\epsilon) = \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm).$$

Cylindrical finite propagation speed and Cheeger Gromov Taylor type estimates.
To prove the index formula we need some pointwise estimates on the Schwartz kernels of functions of the leafwise Dirac operator. Our perturbation on the cylinder has the shape $D + Q$ where Q is some selfadjoint order zero pseudodifferential operator on the base of the cylinder (actually Q is just a sum of a uniformly smoothing operator and $u\,\mathrm{Id}$) in particular one can repeat the proof of energy estimates as in the Book by John Roe for example [79] for the wave equation no more on a small geodesic ball but on a strip $\partial L_x \times (a, b)$ (∂L_x is the base of the cylinder) finding out that unitary cylindrical diffusion speed holds i.e. if ξ_0 is supported in $\partial L_x \times (a, b)$ then the solution of the wave equation $e^{iQ}\xi_0$ is supported in $\partial L_x \times (a-|t|, b+|t|)$. This is sufficient to extimate kernels of class schwartz spectral functions of D and Q following the method of Cheeger, Gromov and Taylor [23] obtaining decaying estimates for the heat kernel

$$|\nabla^l_{z_1}\nabla^k_{z_2}[T^m e^{-tT^2}](z_1, z_2)| \leq C(k, l, m, T)e^{(|s_1-s_2|-r_1)^2/6t}. \tag{3}$$

With the notation $[\cdot]$ one denotes the Schwartz kernel, and r_1 is some positive number while $z_i = (x_i, s_i)$ are two points on the cylinder with $|s_1 - s_2| > 2r_1$. It is clear why one is brought to call these the *Chegeer Gromov Taylor estimates* in the cylindrical direction. There is also an extremely useful relative version of estimate (3) where one can estimate the difference of the kernels of spectral functions of two operators that agree on some open subset U of the cylinder. This is an estimate of the form

$$|\nabla^l_x\nabla^k_y([f(P_1)] - [f(P_2)])_{(x,y)}| \leq \mathcal{C}(P_1, k, l, r_2) \sum_{j=0}^{2\bar{n}+l+k} \int_{\mathbb{R}-J(x,y)} |\hat{f}^{(j)}(s)|ds,$$

where l is a leaf, $r_2 > 0$, $\underline{x, y \in U}$, $Q(x,y) := \max\{\min\{d(x,\partial U); d(y,\partial U)\} - r_2; 0\}$, $J(x,y) := \Big(\dfrac{-Q(x,y)}{c}, \dfrac{Q(x,y)}{c}\Big)$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ is a Schwartz function to apply to the operator using the spectral theorem.
In practice we shall collect all these estimates, one for each leaf. Thanks to the uniformly bounded geometry of the leaves that run trough a compact manifold (with boundary) the constants can be made independend. This is an extremely important fact.

The foliated eta invariant.
Since its first apparition in [5] the eta invariant of a Dirac operator as the difference between the local and global term on the Atiyah Patodi Singer index formula

$$1/2\eta(D_0) = \int_X \omega_D - \{\mathrm{ind}(D^+) + 1/2\,\mathrm{dimKer}(D_0)\}$$

or the spectral asimmetry defined as the regular value at zero of the meromorphic function (summation over eigenvalues)

$$\eta_{D_0}(s) := \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} \frac{\mathrm{sign}\,\lambda}{|\lambda|^s}, \quad \mathrm{Re}(s) > \dim \partial X \tag{4}$$

has become a key concept a in Spectral geometry and modern Physics.
The foliation eta invariant on a compact manifold (when a transverse invariant measure is fixed) was defined independently and essentially in the same way by Peric [70] and Ramachandran [76] and enters into our A.P.S index formula exactly in the way it enters classically. It should be remarked that Peric and Ramachandran numbers are not the same. The reason is simple. Peric uses the holonomy groupoid to desingularize the space of the leaves while Ramachandran works directly on the Borel equivalence relation. Due to their global nature the eta invariants obtained are not the same. As a striking consequence one gets that on a cylindrical foliated manifold every choice of desingularization from the equivalence relation to the holonomy (or the monodromy groupoid) leads to different index formulas with different eta invariants. This is a genuine new feature of the boundary (cylindrical) case.
Since we work with the Borel equivalence relation our eta–invariant is that of Ramachandran. So consider the base Dirac operator $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ the eta function[4] of $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ is defined for $\mathrm{Re}(s) \leq 0$ by

$$\eta(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}, s) := \frac{1}{\Gamma((s+1)/2)} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\, \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} e^{-D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}})dt, \quad |\lambda| > 0, \quad s > -1.$$

It can be shown that this is meromorphic for $\mathrm{Re}(\lambda) \leq 0$ with simple poles at $(\dim \mathcal{F}_\partial - k)/2, \quad k = 0, 1, \dots$ and a regular value at zero.
In this section we describe this result and we extend it to some classes of perturbations of the operator needed in the proof of the index formula. We shall consider perturbations of the form $Q = D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + K$ with K some uniformly smoothing spectral function $K = f(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})$, $f : (-a, a) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For $f = \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}$ more can be said about the family $Q_u := D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} f(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) + u$ in fact we can define

$$\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) = \mathrm{LIM}_{\delta\to 0} \int_\delta^k \frac{t^{-1/2}}{\Gamma(1/2)}\, \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})dt + \int_k^\infty \frac{t^{-1/2}}{\Gamma(1/2)}\, \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})dt$$

where LIM is the constant term in the asymptotic development in powers of δ near zero of the function $\delta \longmapsto \int_\delta^k$. Moreover two important formulas hold true

---

[4] the relation with (4) comes from the identity $\mathrm{sign}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-1} = \Gamma\big(\frac{s+1}{2}\big)^{-1} \int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \lambda e^{-t\lambda^2} dt$

- $\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) - \eta_\Lambda(Q_0) = \mathrm{sign}(u)\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(f(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})$
- $$\eta_\Lambda(Q_0) = 1/2(\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) + \eta_\Lambda(Q_{-u})). \tag{5}$$

This only requires a minimal modification of the proof given by Vaillant [93] for Galois coverings. The point is that the relevant Von Neumann algebras are closed under the Borel functional calculus.

The index formula.
Finally we prove the index formula

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D_0^{\mathcal{F}}) - h_\Lambda^+ + h_\Lambda^+]$$

where $h_\Lambda^\pm := \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm) - \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm)$. Our proof is a modification of Vaillant proof that in turn is inspired by Müller proof of the L^2–index formula on manifolds with corners of codimension two [66]. This is a (of course) a proof based on the heat equation.
The starting point is the identity

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D_\epsilon^+) = \lim_{u\downarrow 0} 1/2\{\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,u}^+) + \mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,-u}^+) + h_{\Lambda,\epsilon}^- - h_{\Lambda,\epsilon}^+\} \tag{6}$$

where

$$h_{\Lambda,\epsilon}^\pm := \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ext}(D_\epsilon^\pm) - \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_\epsilon^\pm)$$

definition also valid for $\epsilon = 0$.
Next we prove

$$\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,u}^+) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,u}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) + g(u) \tag{7}$$

with $g(u) \longrightarrow_u 0$.
Equation (7) combined with (6) and (5) becomes, after the u–limit

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D_\epsilon^+) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_0}) + h_\epsilon^- - h_\epsilon^-.$$

The last step is to assure that under $\epsilon \to 0$ each ϵ–depending object in the above equation goes to the corresponding value for $\epsilon = 0$.

Some words about the proof of (7). This is inspired from the work of Müller [66]. We start from the convergence into the space of leafwise smoothing kernels of $[\exp(-tD_{\epsilon,u}^2)]$ to $[\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_{\epsilon,u})]$. The choice of cut off functions ϕ_k supported in X_{k+1} (X_m is the manifold truncated at $r = m$) gives an exaustion of X into compact pieces. Consider the equation

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,u}^+) = \mathrm{str}_\Lambda\,\chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u}) = \lim_{k\to+\infty}\lim_{t\to+\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-tD_{\epsilon,u}^2}\phi_k) = \\ \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD_{\epsilon,u}^2}\phi_k) - \int_s^\infty \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D_{\epsilon,u}^2 e^{-tD_{\epsilon,u}^2}\phi_k)dt.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The t–integral is splitted into $\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} + \int_{\sqrt{k}}^\infty$ the second one going to zero thanks to the Breuer–Fredholm property of $D_{\epsilon,u}$. More work is needed in the study of the first one, the responsible for the presence of the eta invariant in the formula. Using heavily the relative version of the Cheeger–Gromov–Taylor estimate (3) one shows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0} \int_s^{\sqrt{k}} = 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D_{\epsilon,u}^{\mathcal{F}_0}).$$

The first summand in (8) will lead to the well known local term

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0}\, \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle.$$

This requires some work in developing the appropiate asymptotic expansion. Again we have to consider three pieces of X separately making use of relative kernel estimates to compare the perturbed operator with the original one.

Comparison with Ramachandran index formula.
There's in the literature anothere A.P.S. formula for a Dirac Operator; this the Ramachandran index theorem [76]. This corresponds exactly to the first point of view of A.P.S. index theorem as a solution of a boundary value problem with non–local boundary condition. This section is devoted to show the compatibility of our index formula with that of Ramachandran. This is an important aspect since it represents, for foliations the passage from incomplete closed case to te cylindrical one as in A.P.S.

The signature formula.
The main application of our index formula should be a Hirzebruch type formula for the signature. First we review the A.P.S. version of the Hirzebruch formula,

$$\sigma(X) = \int_X L - \eta(B^{\mathrm{ev}}).$$

in particular the cohomological interpretation they give to the index of their boundary value problem of the signature operator, in fact harmonic forms on the elonged manifolds are naturally isomorphic to the image of the relative cohomology into the absolute one. This is exactly the reason why A.P.S. have to attach an infinite cylinder. Notice that while the Hirzebruch formula for a closed manifold can proved by only topological methods (Hirzebruck used Thom's theory of cobordism) the formula for a manifold with boundary is proved up to now only with analytical methods.
In the case of Galois coverings the theory of Γ–Hilbert modules with their formal dimension permitted to Luck and Schick [60] to define (at least) three equivalent type of L^2 signatures for a regular covering $\Gamma-\tilde{M} \longrightarrow M$ of a manifold with boundary (cylindrical end). This signatures are: analytical signature based upon the index of the signature operator, harmonic signature looking at the harmonic forms on the cylinder, de Rham signature, based on the relative de Rham L^2 cohomology of the covering. The proof of their equivalence is very tricky, the first, harmonic=analytical is made by Vaillant [93], the second is by Luck and Schick and reminds of course the cohomological interpretation A.P.S give but uses strongly the weakly exact long sequence in L^2 together with some essential properties of the Γ dimension (again a Von Neumann dimension).
We show that the theory of Random Hilbert spaces of Connes is strong enough to generalize all the properties of the Γ–dimension, so we are able to generalize the long weakly exact sequence as proved by Cheeger and Gromov [22] valid in the sense of the various Von Neumann algebras defined by leafwise differential forms and the transverse measure.
So we prove that the three defined notions of signature coincide and the following Hirzebruch signature is valid,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\,\mathrm{dR}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})].$$

Acknowledgements
The author wishes to thank his thesis advisor Paolo Piazza for having suggested such a beautiful research topic and for a lot of interesting discussions; his own family for the continuous support, the equipe of the projet Algébres d'opérateurs at the institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu in Paris, in particular Georges Skandalis and Eric Leitchnam for their hospitality and mathematical advices. Also a thank for useful discussions on index theory is due to Moulay T. Benameur.

2 Geometric Setting

Definition 2.1 — A p–dimensional foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on a manifold with boundary X_0 is transverse to the boundary if it is given by a foliated atlas $\{U_\alpha\}$ with homeomorphisms $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \longrightarrow V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$ with V_α open in $\mathbb{H}^p := \{(x_1, ..., x_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p : x_1 \geq 0\}$ and W^q open in $\mathbb{R}^q$ with change of coordinated $\phi_\alpha(u, v)$ of the form

$$v' = \phi(v, w), \quad w' = \psi(w) \tag{9}$$

(ψ is a local diffeomorphism). Such an atlas is assumed to be maximal among all collections of this type. The integer p is the dimension of the foliation, q its codimension and $p+q = \dim(X_0)$.

In each foliated chart, the connected components of subsets as $\phi_\alpha^{-1}(V_\alpha \times \{w\})$ are called plaques. The plaques coalesce (thanks to the change of coordinate condition (9)) to give maximal connected injectively immersed (not embedded !) submanifolds called leaves. One uses the notation $\mathcal{F}$ for the set of leaves. Note that in general each leaf passes infinitely times trough a foliated chart so a foliation is only locally a fibration. Taking the tangent spaces to the leaves one gets an integrable subbundle $T\mathcal{F} \subset TX_0$ that's transverse to the boundary i.e $T\partial X_0 + T\mathcal{F} = TX_0$ in other words the boundary is a submanifold that's transverse to the foliation.

2.1 Holonomy

We skip the definition of a foliation on a manifold without boundary and only recall that is defined by foliated charts as in the definition 2.1 above with local models $U \times V$ where U is an open set in $\mathbb{R}^p$ Let X a manifold equipped with a (p, q)–foliation. If X has boundary the foliation is assumed transverse to the boundary according to definition 2.1.

Definition 2.2 — A map $f : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ is called distinguished if each point x is in the domain of a foliated chart $U \xrightarrow{\phi} V \times W$ such that $f_{|U} = \phi \circ \mathrm{Pr}_V$ where $\mathrm{Pr}_V : U \times V \longrightarrow V$ is the projection on the second factor.

Let $\mathcal{D}$ the collection of all the germs of distinguished maps with the obvious projection $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow X$ sending the germ of f at x onto x. Consider a foliated chart (U, ϕ) and P a plaque of U, then P individuates the set $\tilde{P} \subset \mathcal{D}$ of the distinguished germs $\{[\phi \circ \mathrm{Pr}_V]_x\}_{x \in P}$. When P varies over all the possible foliated charts these sets form the base of a topology of a p–dimensional manifold on $\mathcal{D}$ called the leaf topology. The mapping $\sigma : \mathcal{D} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}$ is a covering ([42]) where $\mathcal{F}$ is the non paracompact manifold equal to the disjoint union of all the leaves (equivalently use the plaques to give X a topology where the connected components are exactly the leaves with their natural topology). Let $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ a continuous leafwise path. Since σ is a covering map there's a holonomy map $h_\gamma : \sigma^{-1}(x) \longrightarrow \sigma^{-1}(y)$ sending the point $\pi \in \sigma^{-1}(x)$ into the endpoint of the unique lifting $\tilde{\gamma}$ of γ starting from π.

Definition 2.3 — A q–dimensional submanifold $Z \subset X$ is a transversal if for every $z \in Z$ there exists a distinguished map $\pi : U \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ such that $\pi_{|Z \cap U}$ is an homeomorphism.

There are many equivalent definitions of transverse submanifold for example at infinitesimal level, one can ask, $T_z Z \oplus T_z \mathcal{F} = T_z X$. The definition given here makes possible to realize that holonomy acts in a natural way on the disjoint union of all transversals [73].

First we give a slight different version of holonomy. For a continuous leafwise path $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ we can choose a path of foliated charts $(U_0, \phi_1), ..., (U_k, \phi_m)$ associated to a decomposition $0 = s_0, ..., 1 = s_m$ of $[0, 1]$ such that $\gamma_{|[s_l, s_{l+1}]} \subset U_l$ and each plaque of U_l meets only a plaque of U_{l+1}. Following the plaques along γ one obtain a mapping of the plaques of U_0 to the plaques U_m hence, composing with the distinguished maps associated a germ of diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}^q$. Since the inclusion of a transversal compose with a distinguished mapping to give coordinates on the transversal this is also a germ of diffeomorphism $H_{T_0 T_1}(\gamma)$ of transversals T_0 around x and T_1 around y.
The connection with the holonomy map given before in terms of the holonomy covering is given as follows. Let $\pi \in \sigma^{-1}(x)$ and f a distinguished map defined around x. The diffeomorphism $H_{T_0 T_1}(\gamma)$ allows to define a local coordinate system on T_1 defined around y and in turn a distinguished map $f_1 : V \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$ defined around y. Then the germ of f_1 at y coincides with $h_\gamma(\pi) \in \sigma^{-1}(y)$.
It is clear that the relation

$$\gamma \sim \tau \quad \text{iff} \quad h_\gamma = h_\gamma(\tau) \tag{10}$$

is weaker than homotopy (obvious by the definition in terms of lifting).

DEFINITION 2.4 — The holonomy groupoid G of the foliation is the quotient of the homotopy groupoid (the set of all equivalence fixed points homotopy classes of leafwise continuous paths) under the relation (10).

One can show that this procedure gives a finite dimensional reduction of the homotopy groupoid. In fact in the case $\partial X = \emptyset$ G is a smooth, in general non–Hausdorff $2p + q$–dimensional manifold where the local coordinates are given by mappings in the form of $(U \times V) \times_{h_\gamma} (U' \times V')$ where $x \in U \times V$, $y \in U' \times V'$, $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ is a leafwise path and one uses the graph of the holonomy $h_\gamma : V \longrightarrow V'$ ([94, 26, 65]). Finally

DEFINITION 2.5 — A pseudogroup of a manifold X is a family Γ of diffeomorphisms defined on open subsets of X such that

1. if $\Phi \in \Gamma$ then $\Phi^{-1} \in \Gamma$
2. Γ is closed under composition when possible (depending on domains and ranges).
3. If $\Phi : U \longrightarrow W$ is in Γ then every restriction of Φ to open subsets $V \subset U$ is in Γ.
4. If $\Phi : U \longrightarrow W$ is a diffeomorphism such that every point in U has a neighborhood on which Φ restricts to an alement of Γ then $\Phi \in \Gamma$.
5. The identity belongs to Γ.

The holonomy pseudogroup of a foliation is the pseudogroup Γ acting on the disjoint union of all (regular) whose germs at every point are germs of holonomy mappings defined by some leafwise path.

EXAMPLE —

Foliated flat bundles (with boundary). A huge class of foliations comes from the theory of the foliated flat bundles. So let Y an n–dimensional compact Riemannian manifold with boundary where the metric is product type near the boundary. Look at its universal cover $\widetilde{Y} \longrightarrow Y$ as a principal bundle with discrete structural group $\Gamma := \pi_1(Y)$ acting on the right as deck trasformations. Lift the metric upside, so $\tilde{Y}$ becomes a manifold with boundary and bounded geometry (definition in section 10.6.1). For every representation $\Phi : \Gamma \longrightarrow \mathrm{Diffeo}(T)$ of Γ as a group of diffeomorphisms of a closed manifold (no boundary) T one can form the associated flat bundle $V \longrightarrow Y$ with fiber T simply composing a cocycle of transition functions of $\widetilde{Y}$ with Φ. More explicitely consider the right, free and proper action $\gamma \circlearrowright \widetilde{Y} \times T$ defined by

$$(\widetilde{y}, \theta) \cdot \gamma := (\widetilde{y}, \gamma\theta)$$

so the quotient space is a compact manifold with boundary V and we have a diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \widetilde{Y} \times T \arrow[dl, "q"'] \arrow[d] \\
V \arrow[dr, "p"] & \widetilde{Y} \arrow[d, "\pi"] \\
 & Y
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $V \to Y$ is a bundle with fiber T. Consider $\widetilde{Y} \times T$, it has the trivial foliation $\widetilde{\mathcal{F}}$ with leaves $\widetilde{Y}_\theta := \widetilde{Y} \times \{\theta\}$ that's normal to the boundary and pushes down with q to an n–dimensional foliation $\mathcal{F}$ on V where each leaf is diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{Y}_\theta / \Gamma(\theta)$, where

$$\Gamma(\theta) := \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \Phi(\gamma)\theta = \theta\}$$

is the stabilizer of θ. Note also that each leave covers Y trough the composition

$$\widetilde{Y}_\theta \longrightarrow \widetilde{T}_\theta / \Gamma(\theta) \longrightarrow^{p} Y.$$

It is a well known fact [65] that here the holonomy group G_x^x is the image of the holonomy mapping

$$\pi^1(L_\theta) \simeq \Gamma(\theta) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Homeo}(F, x)$$

where $\mathrm{Homeo}(F, x)$ is defined as the group of germs of homeomorphisms of F keeping x fixed. So as an explicit example one can take a closed Riemann surface Σ of genus $g > 1$ and $\Gamma = \pi_1(\Sigma)$ is a discrete subgroup of $PSL(2, \mathbb{R})$. Choose points $\{p_1, ..., p_k\}$ and D_j a small disc around p_j. Let $X := \Sigma \setminus \cap_{j=1,\dots,k} D_j$ be the base manifold and the Galois cover is $\Gamma \longrightarrow \widetilde{X} \longrightarrow X$ induced by the universal cover $\mathbb{H}^2 \longrightarrow \Sigma$, $T := \mathbb{S}^1$, with Γ acting on $\mathbb{S}^1$ by fractional linear transformations.

2.2 Longitudinal Dirac operator

Let $X = X_0 \cup Z$ be a connected manifold with cylindrical end meaning that X_0 is a compact manifold with boundary and $Z = \partial X_0 \times [0, \infty)_r$ is the cylindrical end. Suppose that X has a Riemannian metric g that is product type on the cylinder $g_{|Z} = g_{\partial X_0} + dr \otimes dr$.
Let given on X a smooth oriented foliation $\mathcal{F}$ with leaves of dimension $2p$ respecting the cylindrical structure i.e.

1. The submanifold ∂X_0 is transversal to the foliation and inherits a $(2p-1, q)$ foliation $\mathcal{F}_\partial = \mathcal{F}_{|\partial X_0}$ with foliated atlas given by $\phi_\alpha : U_\alpha \cap \partial X_0 \longrightarrow \partial V_\alpha \times W_\alpha$. Note that the codimension is the same.

2. The restriction of the foliation on the cylinder is product type $\mathcal{F}_{|Z} = \mathcal{F}_\partial \times [0, \infty)$.

Note that these conditions imply that the foliation is normal to the boundary. The orientation we choose is the one given by $(e_1, .., e_{2p-1}, \partial_r)$ where $(e_1, .., e_{2p-1})$ is a positive leafwise frame for the induced boundary foliation. As explained in [5] this is a way to fix the boundary Dirac type operator. Let $E \longrightarrow X$ be a leafwise Clifford bundle with leafwise Clifford connection ∇^E and Hermitian metric h^E. Suppose each geometric structure is of product type on the cylinder meaning that if $\rho : \partial X_0 \times [0, \infty) \longrightarrow \partial X_0$ is the base projection

$$E_{|Z} \simeq \rho^*(E_{|\partial X_0}), \quad h^E_{|\partial X_0} = \rho^*(h^E_{|\partial X_0}), \quad \nabla^E_{|Z} = \rho^*(\nabla^E_{|\partial X_0}).$$

Each geometric object restricts to the leaves to give a longitudinal Clifford module that's canonically $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded by the leafwise chirality element. One can check immediately that the positive and negative boundary eigenbundles $E^+_{\partial X_0}$ and $E^-_{\partial X_0}$ are both modules for the Clifford structure of the boundary foliation (see Appendix A.2 for more informations). Leafwise Clifford multiplication by ∂_r induces an isomorphism of leafwise Clifford modules between the positive and negative eigenbundles

$$c(\partial_r) : E^+_{\partial X_0} \longrightarrow E^-_{\partial X_0}.$$

Put $F = E^+_{|\partial X_0}$ the whole Clifford module on the cylinder $E_{|Z}$ can be identified with the pullback $\rho^*(F \oplus F)$ with the following action: tangent vectors to the boundary foliation $v \in T\mathcal{F}_\partial$ acts as $c^E(v) \simeq c^F(v)\Omega$ with $\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ while in the cylindrical direction $c^F(\partial_r) \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. In particular one can form the longitudinal Dirac operator assuming under the above identification the shape[5]

$$D = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + c_{|\mathcal{F}_0}\nabla^{E_{|\mathcal{F}_\partial}} = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} = c(-\partial_r)[-\partial_r - c(-\partial_r)\Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}]. \tag{11}$$

Here $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ is the leafwise Dirac operator on the boundary foliation. In the following, these identifications will be omitted letting D act directly on $F \oplus F$ according to

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^- \\ D^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} : F \oplus F \longrightarrow F \oplus F$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^- \\ D^+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} \\ \partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \partial_u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} \\ -\partial_u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $u = -r$, $\partial_u = -\partial_r$ (interior unit normal) note this is the opposite of A.P.S. notation. We are using the notation $X = X_k \cup Z_k$ with $Z_k = \partial X_0 \times [k, \infty)$ and $X_k = X_0 \cup (\partial X_0 \times [0, k])$ also $Z^b_a := \partial X_0 \times [a, b]$ and where there's no danger of confusion Z_x is the cylinder of the leaf passing trough x, $Z_x = L_x \cap Z_0$.

3 The Atiyah Patodi Singer index theorem

We are going to recall the classical Atiyah–Patodi–Singer index theorem in [5] So let X_0 a compact $2p$ dimensional manifold with boundary ∂X_0 and consider a Clifford bundle E with all the geometric structure as in the previous section. We take here the opposite orientation of A.P.S i.e. we use the exterior unit normal to induce the boundary operator instead of the interior one; as pointed out by A.P.S this is a way to declare what is the positive eigenbundle for the natural splitting. In other words

$$D^+_{\text{here}} = D^-_{\text{APS}}.$$

---

[5] we choose to insert $-\partial_r$ the inward pointing normal to help the comparison with the orientation of A.P.S

The operator writes in a collar around the boundary

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^- \\ D_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_r + D_0 \\ \partial_r + D_0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where ∂_r is the exterior unit normal and D_0 is a Dirac operator on the boundary. It is shown in [4] that the K–theory of the boundary manifold contains topological obstructions to the existence of elliptic boundary value conditions of local type (for the signature operator they are always non zero). If one enlarges the point of view to admit global boundary conditions a Fredholm problem can properly set up. More precisely, consider the boundary operator D_0 acting on the boundary manifold ∂X_0. This is a first order elliptic differential operator with real discrete spectrum on $L^2(\partial X_0; F)$. Let $P = \chi_{[0,\infty)}(D_0)$ be the spectral projection on the non negative part of the spectrum. This is a pseudo–differential operator ([5]). Atiyah Patodi and Singer prove the following facts

- The (unbounded) operator $D^+ : C^\infty(X; E^+, P) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X, E^-)$ with domain

  $$C^\infty(X; E^+, P) := \{s \in C^\infty(X; E^+) : P(s_{|\partial X_0}) = 0\}$$

  is Fredholm and the index is given by the formula

  $$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{APS}}(D^+) = \int_{X_0} \hat{A}(X, \nabla)\,\mathrm{Ch}'(E, \nabla) - h/2 + \eta(0)/2$$

  with the Atiyah–Singer $\hat{A}(X, \nabla)$ differential form[6] with the twisted Chern character $\mathrm{Ch}'(E, \nabla)$ [10, 62] and two correcting terms:

  1. $h := \mathrm{Ker}(D_0)$ is the dimension of the kernel of the boundary operator
  2. $\eta(0)$, the eta invariant of D_0 is a spectral invariant which gives a measure of the asymmetry of the spectrum of the boundary operator D_0. This is extensively explained in section 7.

- The index formula can be interpreted as a natural L^2 problem on the manifold with a cylinder attached, $X = X_0 \cup_{\partial X_0} (\partial X_0 \times [0, \infty))$ with every structure pulled back. More precisely the kernel of $D^+ : C^\infty(X; E^+, P) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X, E^-)$ is naturally isomorphic to the kernel of D^+ extended to an ubounded operator on $L^2(X)$ while to describe the kernel of its Hilbert space adjoint i.e. the closure of D^- with the adjoint boundary condition $D^- : C^\infty(X; E^-, 1 - P) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X, E^+)$ we have to introduce the space of extended L^2 solutions.

  A locally square integrable solution s of the equation $D^- s = 0$ on X is called an extended solution if for large positive r

  $$s(y, r) = g(y, r) + s_\infty(y) \tag{12}$$

  where y is the coordinate on the base ∂X_0 and $g \in L^2$ while s_∞ solves $D_0 s_\infty = 0$ and is called the limiting value of s.

  APS prove that the kernel of $(D^+)^*$ (Hilbert space adjoint of $D^+ : C^\infty(X; E^+, P) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X, E^-)$) is naturally isomorphic to the space of L^2 extended solution of D^- on X. Moreover

  $$\mathrm{ind}_{\mathrm{APS}}(D^+) = \dim_{L^2}(D^+) - \dim_{L^2}(D^-) - h_\infty(D^-) = \mathrm{ind}_{L^2}(D^+) - h_\infty(D^-) \tag{13}$$

---

[6] as explained in the introduction; due to the presence of the boundary one does not have here a cohomological pairing, for this reason the notation $\hat{A}(X, \nabla)$ stresses the dependence from the metric trough the connection ∇

where $\operatorname{ind}_{L^2}(D^+) := \dim_{L^2}(D^+) - \dim_{L^2}(D^-)$ and the number $h_\infty(D^-)$ is the dimension of the space of limiting values of the extended solutions of D^-. In this sense the APS index can be interpreted as an L^2–index. The number at right in (13) is called often the L^2 extended index. Along the proof of (13) the authors prove that

$$h = h_\infty(D^+) + h_\infty(D^-) \tag{14}$$

and conjecture that it must be true at level of the kernel of D_0 i.e.

every section in $\operatorname{Ker}(D_0)$ *is uniquely expressible as a sum of limiting values coming from* D^+ *and* D^-.

The conjecture was solved by Melrose with the invention of the b–calculus, a pseudo–differential calculus on a compactification of X that furnished a totally new point of view on the APS problem [62].

With (13) and (14) the index formula is

$$\operatorname{ind}_{L^2}(D^+) = \int_{X_0} \hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(E) + \frac{\eta(0)}{2} + \frac{h_\infty(D^-) - h_\infty(D^+)}{2}.$$

Finally a naive remark about the introduction of extended solutions in order to motivate our definition of $h_\infty(D^\pm)$ (equation (41) and (82)) in our Von Neumann setting. For a real parameter u say that a distributional section s on the cylinder is in the weighted L^2–space $e^{ur}L^2(\partial X_0 \times [0,\infty); E^\pm)$ if $e^{-ur}s \in L^2$. The operator $D^\pm$ trivially esxtends to act on each weighted space. Now it is evident from (12) that an L^2–extended solution of the equation $D^+s = 0$ is in each $e^{ur}L^2$ for positive u. Viceversa let $s \in \bigcap_{u>0} \operatorname{Ker}_{e^{ur}L^2}(D^+)$. Keep u fixed, then $e^{-ur}s \in L^2$ can be represented in terms of a complete eigenfunction expansion for the boundary operator D_0,

$$e^{-ur}s = \sum_\lambda \phi_\lambda(y)g(r).$$

Solving $D^+s = 0$ together with the condition $e^{-ur}s \in L^2$ leads to the representation (on the cylinder) $s(y,r) = \sum_{\lambda>-u} \phi_\lambda(y)g_{0\lambda}(y)e^{-\lambda r}$. Since u is arbitrary we see that s should have a representation as a sum

$$s(y,r) = \sum_{\lambda\geq 0} \phi_\lambda(y)g_{0\lambda}e^{-\lambda r}$$

over the non negative eigenvalues of D_0, i.e. s is an extended solution with limiting value $\sum_{\lambda=0} \phi_0(y)g_{00}$. We have proved that

$$\operatorname{Ext}(D^\pm) = \bigcap_{u>0} \operatorname{Ker}_{e^u r L^2}(D^\pm).$$

4 Von Neumann algebras, foliations and index theory

4.1 Non–commutative integration theory.

The measure–theoretical framework of non–commutative integration theory is particular fruitful when applied to measured foliations. The non–commutative integration theory of Alain Connes [27] provides us a measure theory on every measurable groupoid $(G, \mathcal{B})$ with $G^{(0)}$ the space of unities. In our applications G will be mostly the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ or sometimes the holonomy groupoid of a foliation. Transverse measures in non–commutative integration theory sense will be defined from holonomy invariant transverse measures. Below a list of fundamental objects and facts. This very brief and simplified survey in fact the general theory admits the existence of a modular function that says, in the case of foliations how transverse measure of sets changes under holonomy(under flows generated by fields tangent to the foliation). Hereafter our modular function is everywhere 1, corresponding to the geometrical case of a foliation equipped with a holonomy invariant transverse measure (this is a definition we give below).

Measurable groupoids . A groupoid is a small cathegory G where every arrow is invertible. The set of objects is denoted by $G^{(0)}$ and there are two maps $s, r : G \longrightarrow G^{(0)}$ where $\gamma : s(\gamma) \longrightarrow r(\gamma)$. Two arrows γ_1, γ_2 can be composed if $r(\gamma_2) = s(\gamma_1)$ and the result is $\gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2$. The set of composable arrows is $G^{(2)} = \{(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) : r(\gamma_2) = s(\gamma_1)\}$. As a notation $G_x = r^{-1}(x)$, $G^x = s^{-1}(x)$ for $x \in G^{(0)}$. An equivalence relation $\mathcal{R} \subset X \times X$ is a groupoid with $r(x, y) = x$ and $s(x, y) = y$, in this manner $(z, x) \cdot (x, y) = (z, y)$. The range of the map $(r, s) : G \longrightarrow G^{(0)} \times G^{(0)}$ is an equivalence relation called the principal groupoid associated to G. In this sense groupoids desingularize equivalence relations. A measurable groupoid is a pair $(G, \mathcal{B})$ where G is a groupoid and $\mathcal{B}$ is a σ–field on G making measurable the structure maps r, s, composition $\circ : G^{(2)} \longrightarrow G$ and the inversion $\gamma \longmapsto \gamma^{-1}$.

Kernels are mappings $x \longmapsto \lambda^x$ where λ^x is a positive measure on G, supported on the r–fiber $G^x = r^{-1}(x)$ with a measurability property i.e. for every set $A \in \mathcal{B}$ the function $y \longmapsto \lambda^y(A) \in [0, +\infty]$ must be measurable.

A kernel λ is called proper if there exists an increasing family of measurable sets $(A_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $G = \cup_n A_n$ making the functions $\gamma \longmapsto \lambda^{s(\gamma)}(\gamma^{-1}(A))$ bounded for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The point here is that every element $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ in G defines by left traslation a measure space isomorphism $G^x \longrightarrow G^y$ and calling

$$R(\lambda)_\gamma := \gamma\lambda^x \tag{15}$$

here $\gamma\lambda_x$ is push–forward measure under the γ–right traslation) one has a kernel in the usual sense i.e. a mapping with value measures. The definition of properness is in fact properness for $R(\lambda)$.

The space of proper kernels is denoted by $\mathcal{C}^+$.

Transverse functions are kernels $(\nu^x)_{x\in X}$ with the left invariance property $\gamma\nu^{s(\gamma)} = \nu^{r(\gamma)}$ for every $\gamma \in G$. One checks at once that properness is equivalent to the existence of an increasing family of measurable sets $(A_n)_n$ with $G = \cup_n A_n$ such that the functions $x \longmapsto \nu^x(A_n)$ are bounded for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The space of proper transverse functions is denoted $\mathcal{E}^+$.

The support of a transverse function ν is the measurable set $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) = \{x \in G^{(0)} : \nu^x \neq 0\}$. This is *saturated* w.r.t. the equivalence relation induced by G on $G^{(0)}$, $x\mathcal{R}y$ iff there exists $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$. If $\mathrm{supp}(\nu) = G^{(0)}$ we say that ν is faithful.

When $G = \mathcal{R}$ or the holonomy groupoid this gives families of positive measures one for each leaf in fact in the first case the invariance property is trivial, in the second case we are giving a measure ν^x on each holonomy cover G^x with base point x but the invariance property says that these are invariant under the deck trasformations together with the change of base points then push forward on the leaf under $r : G^x \longrightarrow L_x$.

Convolution. The groupoid structure provides an operation on kernels. For fixed kernels λ_1 and, λ_2 on G their convolution product is the kernel $\lambda_1 * \lambda_2$ defined by

$$(\lambda_1 * \lambda_2)^y = \int (\gamma\lambda_2^x) d\lambda_1^y(\gamma), \quad y \in X.$$

It is a fact that if λ is a kernel and ν is a transverse function then $\nu * \lambda$ is a transverse function. Clearly $R(\lambda_1 * \lambda_2) = R(\lambda_1) \circ R(\lambda)$ the standard composition of kernels on a measure space. Here $R(\cdot)$ is that of equation (15)

Transverse invariant measures (actually transverse measures of modulo $\delta = 1$). These are linear mappings $\Lambda : \mathcal{E}^+ \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that

1. Λ is normal i.e $\Lambda(\sup \nu_n) = \sup \Lambda(\nu_n)$ for every increasing sequence ν_n in $\mathcal{E}^+$ bounded by a transverse function. Since the sequence is bounded by an element of $\mathcal{E}^+$ the expression $\sup \nu_n$ makes sense in $\mathcal{E}^+$.
2. Λ is invariant under the right traslation of G on $\mathcal{E}^+$. This means that

$$\Lambda(\nu) = \Lambda(\nu * \lambda)$$

for every $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ and kernel λ such that $\lambda^y(1) = 1$ for every $y \in G^{(0)}$.

A transverse measure is called semi–finite if it is determined by its finite values i.e $\Lambda(\nu) = \sup\{\Lambda(\nu'),\ \nu' \leq \nu,\ \Lambda(\nu') < \infty\}$. We shall consider only semi–finite measures.

A transverse measure is σ–finite if there exists a faithful transverse function ν of kind $\nu = \sup \nu_n$ with $\lambda(\nu_n) < \infty$.

The coupling of a transverse function $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ and a transverse measure Λ produces a positive measure Λ_ν on $G^{(0)}$ through the equation $\Lambda_\nu(f) := \Lambda((f \circ s)\nu$ the invariance property reflects downstairs (in the base of the groupoid) in the property $\Lambda_\nu(\lambda) = \Lambda(\nu * \lambda)$ for $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ and $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}^+$.

Measures on the base $G^{(0)}$ that can be represented as Λ_ν are characterized by a theorem of disintegration of measures.

THEOREM 4.5 — (Connes [26]) Let ν be a transverse proper function with support A. The mapping $\Lambda \longmapsto \Lambda_\nu$ is a bijection between the set of transverse measures on $G_A^A = r^{-1}(A) \cup s^{-1}(A)$ and the set of positive measures μ on $G^{(0)}$ satisfying the following equivalent relations

1. $(\mu \circ \nu)\tilde{} = \mu \circ \nu$
2. $\lambda, \lambda' \in \mathcal{C}^+, \nu * \lambda = \nu * \lambda' \in \epsilon^+ \Longrightarrow \mu(\lambda(1)) = \mu(\lambda'(1))$.

Nex we shall explain this procedure of disintegration in a geometrical way for foliations.

We shall see that what is important here is the class of null–measure subsets of $G^{(0)}$. A saturated set $A \subset G^{(0)}$ is called Λ–negligible if $\Lambda_\nu(A) = 0$ for every $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$.

Representations. Let H be a measurable field of Hilbert spaces; by definition this is a mapping $x \longmapsto H_x$ from $G^{(0)}$ with values Hilbert spaces. The measurability structure is assigned by a linear subspace $\mathcal{M}$ of the free product vector space of the whole family $\Pi_{x \in G^{(0)}} H_x$ meaning that

1. For every $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$ the function $x \longmapsto \|\xi(x)\|$ is measurable.
2. A section $\eta \in \Pi_{x \in G^{(0)}} H_x$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}$ if and only if the function $\langle \eta(x), \xi(x) \rangle$ is measurable for every $\xi \in \mathcal{M}$.
3. There exists a sequence $\{\xi_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ such that $\{\xi_i(x)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathcal{M}$ is dense in H_x for every x.

Elements of $\mathcal{M}$ are called measurable sections of H.

Suppose a measure μ on $G^{(0)}$ has been chosen. One can put together the Hilbert spaces H_x taking their direct integral

$$\int H_x d\mu(x).$$

This is defined as follows, first select the set of square integrable sections in $\mathcal{M}$. This is the set of sections s such that the integral $\int_{G^{(0)}} \|s(x)\|^2_{H_x} d\mu(x) < \infty$ then identitify two square integrable sections if they are equal outside a μ–null set. The direct integral comes equipped with a natural Hilbert space structure with product

$$\langle s, t\rangle := \int_{G^{(0)}} \langle s(x), t(x)\rangle_{H_x} d\mu(x).$$

The notation $s = \int_{G^{(0)}} s(x)d\mu(x)$ for an element of the direct integral is clear. A field of bounded operators $x \longmapsto B_x \in B(H_x)$ is called measurable if sends measurable sections to measurable sections. A mesurable family of operators with operator norms uniformely bounded $\operatorname{ess\,sup} \|B_x\| < \infty$ defines a bounded operator called decomposable $B := \int_{G^{(0)}} B_x d\mu(x)$ on the direct integral in the simplest way

$$Bs := \int_{G^{(0)}} B_x d\mu(x)\, s = \int_{G^{(0)}} B_x s(x) d\mu(x).$$

For example each element of the abelian Von Neumann algebra $L^\infty_\mu(G^{(0)})$ defines a decomposable operator acting by pointwise multiplication. One gets an involutive algebraic isomorphism of $L^\infty_\mu(G^{(0)})$ onto its image in $B(\int H_x d\mu(x))$ called the algebra of diagonal operators. One can ask when a bounded operator $T \in B(\int H_x d\mu(x))$ is decomposable i.e. when $T = \int T_x d\mu(x)$ for a family of uniformely bounded operators $(T_x)_x$. The answer is precisely when it belongs to the commutant of the diagonal algebra.

A representation of G on H is the datum of an Hilbert space isomorphism $U(\gamma) : H_{s(\gamma)} \longrightarrow H_{r(\gamma)}$ for every $\gamma \in G$ with

1. $U(\gamma_1^{-1}\gamma_2) = U(\gamma_1)^{-1}U(\gamma_2), \quad \forall \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in G, \quad r(\gamma_1) = r(\gamma_2).$
2. For every couple ξ, η of measurable section the function defined on G according to $\gamma \longmapsto \langle \eta_{r(\gamma)}, U(\gamma)\eta_{s(\gamma)}\rangle$, is measurable.

A fundamental example is given by the left regular representation of G defined by a proper transverse function $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ in the following way. The measurable field of Hilbert space is $L^2(G, \nu)$ defined by $x \longmapsto L^2(G^x, \nu^x)$ with the unique measurable structure making measurable the family of sections of the kind $y \longmapsto f_{|G^x}$ obtained from every measurable f on G such that each $\int |f|^2 d\nu^x$ is finite. For every $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ in G one has the left traslation $L(\gamma) : L^2(G^x, \nu^x) \longrightarrow L^2(G^y, \nu^y), \quad (L(\gamma)f)(\gamma') = f(\gamma^{-1}\gamma'), \gamma' \in G^y.$

Intertwining operators are morphisms between representations. If (H, U), (H', U') are representations of G an intertwining operator is a measurable family of operators $(T_x)_{x \in G^{(0)}}$ of bounded operators $T_x : H_x \longrightarrow H'_x$ such that

1. Uniform boundedness; $\operatorname{ess\,sup} \|T_x\| < \infty$.
2. For every $\gamma \in G$ $U'(\gamma)T_{s(\gamma)} = T_{r(\gamma)}U(\gamma)$.

Looking at a representation as a measurable functor, an intertwining operator gives a natural transformation between representations. The vector space of intertwing operators from H to H' is denoted by $\mathrm{Hom}_G(H, H')$.

Square integrable representations. Fix some transverse function $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$. For a representation of G the property of being equivalent to some sub–representation of the infinite sum of the regular left representation L^ν is independent of ν and is the definition of square integrability for representations. Actually, due to measurability issues much care is needed here to define sub representations (see section 4 in [26]) but the next fundamental remark assures that square integrable representations are very commons in applications.

Measurable functors and representations. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_+$ be the cathegory of (standard) measure spaces without atoms i.e. objects are triples $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{A}, \alpha)$ where $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{A})$ is a standard measure space and α is a σ–finite positive measure.

Measurability of a functor $F : G \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_+$ is a measure structure on the disjoint union $Y = \bigcup_{x \in G^{(0)}} F(x)$ making the following structural mappings measurable

1. The projection $\pi : Y \longrightarrow G^{(0)}$.
2. The natural bijection $\pi^{-1}(x) \longrightarrow F(x)$.
3. The map $x \longmapsto \alpha^x$, a σ–finite measure on $F(x)$.
4. The map sending $(\gamma, z) \in G \times X$ with $s(\gamma) = \pi(z)$ into $F(\gamma)z \in Y$.

Usually one assumes that Y is union of a denumerable collection $(Y_n)_n$ making every function $\alpha^x(Y_n)$ bounded. With a measurable functor F one has an associated representation of G denoted by $L^2 \bullet F$ defined in the following way: the field of Hilbert space is $x \longmapsto L^2(F(x), \alpha^x)$ and if $\gamma : x \longrightarrow y$ then define $U(\gamma) : L^2(F(x), \alpha^x) \longrightarrow L^2(F(y), \alpha^y)$ by $f \longmapsto F(\gamma^{-1}) \circ f$. Proposition 20 in [26] shows that this is a square–integrable representation.

Random hilbert spaces and Von Neumann algebras. We have seen that every fixed transverse measure Λ defines a notion of Λ–null measure sets (for saturated sets) hence an equivalence relation on $\mathrm{End}_G(H_1, H_2)$ the vector space of all intertwining operators $T : H_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ between two square integrable representations H_i. Each equivalence class is called a random operator and the set of random operators is denoted by $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H_1, H_2)$. Also square integrable representations can be identified modulo Λ–null sets. An equivalence class of square integrable representations is by definition a random hilbert space.

Theorem 2 in [26] says that $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ is a Von Neumann algebra for every random Hilbert space.

More precisely choose some $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ and put $\mu = \Lambda_\nu$ and $m := \mu \bullet \nu$ to form the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = L^2(G, m)$. For a function f on G denote $Jf = f^\sharp(\gamma) = f(\bar{\gamma}^{-1})$, consider the space $\mathcal{A}$ of measurable functions f on G such that $f, f^\sharp \in L^2(G, m)$ and $\sup(\nu|f^\sharp|) < \infty$. Equip $\mathcal{A}$ with the product $f *_\nu g = f\nu * g$. The structure $\mathcal{A}$ has is that of an Hilbert algebra (a left–Hilbert algebra in the modular case) i.e $\mathcal{A}$ is a $*$–algebra with positive definite (separable) pre–Hilbert structure such that

1. $\langle x, y \rangle = \langle y^*, x^* \rangle, \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}$.
2. The representation of $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ by left multiplication is bounded, involutive and faithful.

With such structure one can speak about the left regular representation λ of $\mathcal{A}$ on the Hilbert space completion $\mathcal{H}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ itself. The double commutant $\lambda''(\mathcal{A})$ of this representation is the Von Neumann algebra $W(\mathcal{A})$ associated to the Hilbert algebra $\mathcal{A}$.

It is a remarkable fact that $W(\mathcal{A})$ comes equipped with a semifinite faithful normal trace τ such that

$$\tau(\lambda(y^*)\tau(x)) = \langle x, y\rangle \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Furthermore one knows that the commutant of $\lambda(\mathcal{A})$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is generated by the algebra of right multiplications $\lambda'(\mathcal{A}) = J\lambda(\mathcal{A})J$ for the conjugate–linear isometry $J : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}$ defined by the involution in $\mathcal{A}$. For every Λ–random Hilbert space H one can use the measure Λ_ν on $G^{(0)}$ to form the direct integral $\nu(H) = \int H_x d\Lambda_\nu(x)$. Remember that the direct integral is the set of equivalence classes modulo Λ_ν zero measure of square integrable measurable sections. Now, directly from the definition, an intertwining operator $T \in \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(H_1, H_2)$ is a decomposable operator defining a bounded operator $\nu(T) : \nu(H_1) \longrightarrow \nu(H_2)$.

Put $W(\nu)$ for the Von Neumann algebra associated to the Hilbert algebra $L^2(G, m)$, $m = \Lambda_\nu \bullet \nu$, $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$.

THEOREM 4.5 — (Connes) Fix some transverse function $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$

1. For every Λ–random Hilbert space H there exists a unique normal representation of $W(\nu)$ in $\nu(H)$ such that $U_\nu(f) = U(f\nu)$ $f \in \mathcal{A}_\nu$. Here $U(f\nu)$ is defined by $(U(f\nu)\xi)_y = \int U(\gamma)\xi_x d(f\nu^y)(\gamma)$.
2. The correspondence $H \longmapsto \nu(H)$, $T \longmapsto \nu(T)$ is a functor from the (W^*)–cathegory $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$ of random Hilbert spaces and intertwining operators to the category of $W(\nu)$ modules.
3. If the transverse measure ν is faithful the functor above is an equivalence of cathegories.

Then in the case of faithful transverse measures one gets an isometry of $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ on the commutant of $W(\nu)$ on the direct integral $\nu(H)$. In particular $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ is a Von Neumann algebra.

Transverse integrals. The most important notion of non commutative integration theory is the integral of a random variable against a transverse measure. A positive random variable on $(G, \mathcal{B}, \Lambda)$ is nothing but a measurable functor F as defined above. Let $X := \bigcup_{x\in G^{(0)}} F(x)$ disjoint union measure space and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^+$ the space of measurable functions with values in $[0, +\infty]$ while $\mathcal{F}^+$ is for functions with values on $(0, +\infty]$. Kernels λ on G acts as convolution kernels on $\bar{\mathcal{F}}^+$ according to $(\lambda * f)(z) = \int f(\gamma^{-1}z)d\lambda^y(\gamma)$, $y = \pi(z) \in G^{(0)}$. This is an associative operation $(\lambda_1 * \lambda_2) * f = \lambda_1 * (\lambda_2 * f)$.

Now to define the integral $\int F d\lambda$ choose some ν faithful and put

$$\int F d\lambda = \sup\{\Lambda_\nu(\alpha(f)),\ f \in \mathcal{F}^+,\ \nu * f \leq 1\},$$

this is independent from ν and enjoys the following properties

1. there exist random variables F_1, F_2 with $F = F_1 \oplus F_2$ such that $\int F_1 d\Lambda = 0$ and a function $f_2 \in \mathcal{F}^+(X_2)$ with $X_2 = \bigcup_{x\in G^{(0)}} F_2(x)$ with $\nu * f_2 = 1$.
2. Monotony. If $f, f' \in \mathcal{F}(X)$ satisfy $\nu * f \leq \nu * f' \leq 1$ then

   $$\Lambda_\nu((\alpha(f)) \leq \Lambda_\nu((\alpha(f'))$$

   in particular for F_2 as in 1.

   $$\int F_2 d\Lambda = \Lambda_\nu((\alpha(f')).$$

Traces. Let A be a Von Neumann algebra with the cone of positive elements A^+.

A weight on a A is a functional $\phi : A^+ \longrightarrow [0, \infty]$ such that

1. $\phi(a+b) = \phi(a) + \phi(b)$, $a, b \in A^+$
2. $\phi(\alpha a) = \alpha\phi(a)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $a \in A^+$.

a weight is a trace if $\phi(a^*a) = \phi(aa^*)$, $a \in A^+$. A weight is called

- faithful if $\phi(a) = 0 \Rightarrow a = 0$, $a \in A^+$.
- normal if for every increasing net $\{a_i\}_i$ of positive elements with least upper bound a then
$$\phi(a) = \sup\{\phi(a_i)\}.$$
- Semifinite if the linear span of a the set of ϕ–finite elements, $\{a \in A^+ : \phi(a) < \infty\}$ is σ–weak dense.

Every V.N algebra has a semifinite normal faithful weight.

The Von Neumann algebra $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ associated to a square integrable representation comes equipped with a bijection $T \longmapsto \Phi_T$ between positive operators and semifinite normal weights $\Phi_T : \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ where Φ_T is faithful if and only if T_x is not singular Λ–a.e. The construction of this correspondence uses the fact, for a faithful transverse function ν the direct integral $\nu(H) = \int H_x d\Lambda_\nu(x)$ is a module over the Von Neumann algebra $W(\nu)$ associated to the Hilbert algebra $\mathcal{A}$ above described.

The notation of Connes is

$$\Phi_T(1) := \int \mathrm{Trace}(T_x) d\Lambda(x)$$

i.e. the mapping $T \longmapsto \Phi_T(1)$ is the canonical trace on $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$. In fact this is related to the type I Von Neumann algebra P of classes modulo equality Λ_ν almost everywhere of measurable fields $(B_x)_{x \in G^{(0)}}$, $B_x \in B(H_x)$ of bounded operators. Remember that P has a canonical trace $\rho(B) = \int \mathrm{Trace}(B_x) d\Lambda_\nu(x)$ hence we can define

$$\rho_T(B) := \int \mathrm{Trace}(T_x B_x) d\Lambda_\nu(x).$$

The next lemma will be important in our applications

Lemma 4.6 — For a faithful transverse function ν there's a unique operator valued weight[7] E_ν from P to $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
P^+ \arrow[d, "E_\nu"'] \arrow[dr, "\rho_T(\cdot)=\int \mathrm{Trace}(T_x \cdot) d\Lambda_\nu(x)"] & \\
\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H) \arrow[r, "\Phi_T"'] & \mathbb{C}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Moreover E_ν is such that if $B = (B_x)_{x \in G^{(0)}}$, $B \in P^+$ if an operator making bounded the corresponding family

$$C_y := \int U(\gamma) B_x U(\gamma)^{-1} d\nu^y$$

---

[7] see [89] for the definition

then $E_\nu(B) = C$.

Let F be a random variable and put $H = L^2 \bullet F$. The integration process above defines a semi–finite faithful trace on the Von Neumann algebra $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$. In fact, for $T \in \mathrm{End}^+_\Lambda(H)$ let F_T the new random variable defined by $x \mapsto (F(x), \alpha_T(x))$ where $\alpha_T(x)$ is the measure on $F(x)$ such that $\alpha_T(x)(f) = \mathrm{Trace}_{\mathrm{L}^2}(T_x^{1/2} M(f) T_x^{1/2})$ where f is a bounded measurable function on $F(x)$ and $M(f)$ the corresponding multiplication operator on $L^2(F(x))$. The trace is

$$\Phi_T(1) = \int F_T d\Lambda.$$

In the following we shall use often the notation $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(T) = \Phi_T(1)$ to emphasize the dependence on Λ.

With a trace one can develop a dimesion theory for square integrable representation i.e. a dimension theory for random Hilbert spaces that's very similar to the dimension theory of Γ–Hilbert modules.

The formal dimension of the random Hilbert space H is

$$\dim_\Lambda(H) = \int \mathrm{Trace}(1_{H_x}) d\Lambda(x)$$

here some fundamental properties

Lemma 4.7 —

1. If $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(H_1, H_2)$ contains an invertible element then $\dim_\Lambda(H_1) = \dim_\Lambda(H_2)$.
2. $\dim_\Lambda(\oplus H_i) = \sum \dim_\Lambda(H_i)$.
3. $\dim_{\sum \Lambda_i}(\oplus H) = \sum \dim_{\Lambda_i}(H)$.

Formal dimensions and projections We need more properties of the formal dimension that are implicit in Connes work but not listed above.

Start to consider sub–square integrable representation. Consider a Random Hilbert space (H, U); if for every x one choose in a mesurable way a closed subspace K such that $U(\gamma) : K_x \longrightarrow K_y$ for every $\gamma \in G$ we say that (K, V), $V(\gamma) := U(\gamma)_{|i_x K_x}$ is a sub Random Hilbert space. Once a faithful $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ is keeped fixed, the functor ν in theorem 4.4, page 23 displays H and K as submodules of the V.N. algebra associated to the Hilbert Algebra $\mathcal{A}$, hence there must be an injection $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(K) \longrightarrow \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$. In fact from the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W(\nu) \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & B(\nu(H)) \\
& B(\nu(K)) \arrow[u, "\nu(i)"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

we see that multiplication by the bounded operator $\nu(i) = \int_{G^{(0)}} \nu(i_x) d\Lambda_\nu(x)$ sends the commutator of $W(\nu)$ in $B(\nu(K))$ into its commutator in $B(\nu(H))$. To check that the natural traces $\varphi^H \in P(\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H))$ and $\varphi^K \in P(\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(K))$ are preserved by this inclusion we can examine with more detail the meaning of square integrability for a representation. So let us consider the subset of measurable vector fields

$$D(V,\nu) := \Big\{\xi : \exists c > 0 : \forall y \in G^{(0)}, \forall \alpha \in K_y \int_{G^y} |\langle \alpha, V(\gamma)\xi_x\rangle_{K_y}|^2 d\nu(\gamma) \leq c^2\|\alpha\|^2\Big\}.$$

The definition of square integrability is equivalent to the statement that $D(V,\nu)$ contains a denumerable total subset. In other words the operation of assigning a coefficient $\alpha \longmapsto T_\nu(\xi)\alpha = (\alpha,\xi)$ defines an intertwining operator from V to the left regular representation of L^ν of G, on the field of Hilbert spaces $L^2(R^x,\nu^x)_x$. This has the property $T_\nu(\xi)^* f = V(f\nu)\xi, \quad \xi \in D(V,\nu)$ if $\nu|f|$ is bounded. Then, for $\xi,\eta \in D(V,\nu)$ the operator

$$\theta_\nu(\xi,\eta) := T_\nu(\xi)^* T_\nu(\eta) \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(K)$$

and the following interesting formula holds $(\theta_\nu(\xi,\eta)\xi',\eta') = (\xi',\eta) *_\nu (\eta',\xi)^v$ for bounded measurable sections of K. Furthermore the vector space $\mathcal{J}_\nu$ generated by couples $\xi,\eta \in D$ is a bilateral ideal and respects ordening for transverse functions, $\mathcal{J}_\nu \subset \mathcal{J}_{\nu'}$ if $\nu \leq \nu'$. Since the measure ν is faithful this is also weakly dense hence completely determines the trace by the simple formula

$$\varphi^K(\theta_\nu(\xi,\xi)) = \int_{G^{(0)}} \langle \xi_x, \xi_x\rangle d\Lambda_\nu(x), \quad \xi \in D(V,K). \tag{16}$$

Now via i we get an inclusion $D(V,\nu) \subset D(U,\nu)$ let's check this statement: let $\xi \in D(V,\nu)$, $y \in G^{(0)}$, $\alpha \in H_y$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{G^y} |\langle \alpha, U(\gamma) i_x \xi_x\rangle_{K_x}|^2 d\nu(\gamma) &= \int_{G^y} |\langle \alpha, i_x V(\gamma)\xi_x\rangle|^2_{K_x} d\nu(\gamma)\\ &= \int_{G^y} |\langle P_{H_y}\alpha, V(\gamma)\xi_x\rangle|^2 d\nu(\gamma) \leq c^2\|\alpha\|^2.\end{aligned}$$

It turns out that under the inclusion $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(K) \longrightarrow \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ it is essential to check how a $\theta_\nu(\xi,\xi)$ acts on H and to check that the two natural traces are equal. These two problems are very simple now since for $\xi \in D(V,K)$ the endomorphism $\theta_\nu(\xi,\xi)$ under the inclusion is sent in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ to the operator

$$\theta_\nu(i\xi, i\xi) = T_\nu(i\xi)^* T(i\xi) = i^* T_\nu(\xi) T_\nu(\xi) i. \tag{17}$$

We can prove the following

LEMMA 4.8 —

1. The natural traces are compatible w.r.t. the inclusions, in other words we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(K) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\varphi^K"] & \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H) \arrow[dl, "\varphi^H"] \\ \mathbb{R} & \end{tikzcd}$$

2. To get the formal dimension of K as a Random Hilbert space is sufficient to trace the corresponding field of projections in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$

Proof— By the computation (17) above, the density result on the ideal $\mathcal{J}_\nu$ and formula (16) it is suffcient to check the next identity

$$\varphi^H(\theta_\nu(i\xi,i\xi)) = \varphi^H(T_\nu(i\xi)^*T_\nu(i\xi)) = \int_{G^{(0)}} \langle i_x\xi_x, i_x\xi_x\rangle_H d\Lambda_\nu(x)$$
$$= \int_{G^{(0)}} \langle \xi_x,\xi_x\rangle_K d\Lambda_\nu(x) = \varphi^K(\theta_\nu(\xi,\xi)).$$

□

Now we have tools to prove two crucial properties of the formal dimension similar to the properties of the dimension of Γ– Hilbert modules (compare Chapter 1. of [57])

Proposition 4.9 — Let $\{(H^{(i)},U^{(i)})\}_{i\in I}$ a system of Random Hilbert subspaces of (H,U) directed by $\subset$ then

$$\dim_\Lambda(\text{closure}\Big(\bigcup_{i\in I} H^{(i)}\Big)\Big) = \sup\{\dim_\Lambda H_i, i\in I\}$$

If the system is directed by $\supset$ then

$$\dim_\Lambda\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} H^{(i)}\Big) = \inf\{\dim_\Lambda H_i, i\in I\}$$

Proof— The choice of a faithful normal transverse function $\nu\in\mathcal{E}^+$ estabilishes the equivalence of categories described above between C_Λ and the cat. of normal representations of the Von Neumann algebra associated with $W(\nu)$; the first statement then follows from the compatibility of the natural traces proved in 4.8 and the normality (the passage to sup) of the trace in the limit square integrable representation. The second statement follows from the first adopting a standard trick changing a decreasing system into an increasing one. It is in fact sufficient to consider $H^{(i)\perp}$ and observe

$$\Big(\bigcup_{i\in I} H^{(i)\perp}\Big)^{\perp} = \bigcap_{i\in I} H^{(i)}.$$

From the fact that the family is bounded by H we can write the following equation with finite Λ–dimensions

$$\dim_\Lambda\Big(H^{(i)\perp}\Big) = \dim_\Lambda(H) - \dim_\Lambda(H^{(i)})$$

□

4.2 Holonomy invariant transverse measures

The main example of a non commutative measure space is the space of leaves of a foliation. It is in general impossible to look at the space of leaves as a quotient measure space. A famous example is the Cronecker foliation on the thorus $\mathbb{T}^2$ given by irrational flows ([27]). This foliation is also a foliated flat bundle, so we can describe it, using the notations of example 2.1

EXAMPLE —

The Kronecker foliation. Let the group $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}$ and the covering $\widetilde{Y} = \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{S}^1 = Y$. Also let $T = \mathbb{S}^1$. The group $\mathbb{Z}$ acts on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{S}^1$ according to $n \cdot (r, e^{i\theta}) := (r + n, e^{i(\theta + n\alpha)})$ where a real number α has been fixed. Then if $\alpha/2\pi$ is irrational each leaf of the corresponding foliation is a copy of the real line and wires densely around $\mathbb{T}^2$.

This foliation is ergodic i.e. a function almost everywhere constant along the leaves must be constant on the ambient. In particular every Lebesgue space of classical analysis is one dimensional isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$.

A central concept is that of holonomy invariant transverse measure introduced by Plante [73] and Ruelle and Sullivan [83]. According to Connes [26] a transverse measure provides a measure on the space of leaves. Actually there exists a more general modular theory. Holonomy invariant measures correspond to the simplest case.

4.2.1 Measures and currents

Let X be a manifold equipped with a foliation of dimension p and codimension q. We suppose always that the foliation is *oriented* i.e. the bundle of degree p leafwise forms $\Lambda^p_{\mathbb{C}} T\mathcal{F}$ is trivial. This is not truly a restrictive assumption, in fact in the non–orientable case one can make use of densities instead of forms to define currents. Currents are directly related to holonomy invariant transverse measures by the Ruelle–Sullivan isomorphism. The goal of this section is to introduce all these notions and prove the relations between them.
There is a weak version of the concept of a transversal

DEFINITION 4.10 — A Borel subset $T \subset X$ is called a Borel transversal if the intersection of T with each leaf is (finite) denumerable.

The set of all Borel transversals $\mathcal{T}$ is a σ–ring i.e it is closed under the operation of relative complementation and denumerable union. Recall that a σ–ring is a σ–algebra if contains the entire space. This is in general not the case for the set of all Borel transversals hence holonomy measures will be defined only on σ–rings.

DEFINITION 4.11 — A holonomy invariant transverse measure is a σ–additive map $\mu : \mathcal{T} \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ such that

1. For a Borel bijection $\psi : B_1 \longrightarrow B_2$ with $\psi(x) \sim x$ (the relation of being on the same leaf) then $\mu(B_1) = \mu(B_2)$.
2. μ is Radon i.e. for every compact $K \subset B$ then $\mu(K) < \infty$.

DEFINITION 4.12 — A holonomy invariant transverse distribution is the datum for every transverse submanifold T of a linear and continuous[8] map $\delta_T : C^\infty_c(T) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that if $\psi : T_1 \longrightarrow T_2$ is the holonomy of a path γ on X,

$$\langle \delta_{T_1}, f \rangle = \langle \delta_{T_2}, f \circ \psi \rangle.$$

Now let $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{cont}}(C^\infty_c(\wedge^d T^*_{\mathbb{C}} X), \mathbb{C})$ the space of d–dimensional currents on X. This is the dual space of the t.v.s. given by the compactly supported d–forms equipped with the topology of

---

[8] w.r.t. the usual topology of the direct limit i.e. a distribution in the usual sense

the direct limit of Frechet spaces. The operations of Lie derivative L_V and contraction i_V w.r.t. a vector field V and the de Rham exterior derivative d extends to distribution just by duality [27].
Note that a d–differential form ω can be restricted to a subbundle S of the tangent bundle just by evaluation of ω to the d–vectors belonging to $\wedge^d S^*_{\mathbb{C}} \subset \wedge^p T^* X_{\mathbb{C}}$.

Definition 4.13 — A d–dimensional current (d is the dimension of the leaves) C is said a foliated current if it is invariant under the operation of restriction i.e $\langle C, \omega\rangle = 0$ for every p–form ω such that $\omega_{|T\mathcal{F}} = 0$.

Notice that for a d–dimensional foliated current C the condition of being closed is equivalent to require $\partial_X C = 0$ for every section $X \in C^\infty(X; T\mathcal{F})$.

Proposition 4.14 — For a manifold X equipped with a d–dimensional foliation is equivalent to give

1. A holonomy invariant transverse distribution.
2. A closed foliated d–current.

Proof— We define first holonomy invariant transverse distributions relative to regular atlas and show that they define closed foliated d–currents. Since the definition of current does not depend on the atlas and every h.i.t. distribution restricts to a h.i.t. distribution relative to each regular atlas the proof will be complete. For a foliated chart $\Omega \longrightarrow V \subset \mathbb{R}^{n-d} \times \mathbb{R}^d$ the local transversal associated is the quotient space defined by the relation $x \sim y$ if x, y belongs to the same plaque of Ω. In particular a local transversal is the space of plaques in Ω. We say that the inclusion $\Omega \hookrightarrow \Omega'$ of distinct open sets is regular and write $\Omega \lhd \Omega'$ if the inclusion mapping $i : \Omega \hookrightarrow \Omega'$ passes to the quotient to define a smooth mapping on the transversals. In particular each plaque of Ω meets only a plaque of Ω'.
We say that a foliated atlas $\{(\Omega_i, \phi_i)\}_i$ of $(X, \mathcal{F})$ of foliated charts Ω_i is a good cover if

1. $\{\Omega_i\}_i$ is locally finite
2. for every i, j such that $\overline{\Omega}_i \cap \overline{\Omega}_j \neq \emptyset$ there exist a distinct open set Ω such that $\Omega_i \lhd \Omega$ and $\Omega_j \lhd \Omega$.

Standard methods show that a regular atlas always exists.
Now define a transverse distribution relative to a regular cover to be a distribution on every local transversal T_Ω of each finite intersection $\Omega = \Omega_1 \cap ... \cap \Omega_k$ with the property of (relative) holonomy invariance i.e the distribution associated to $T_{\Omega\cap\Omega'}$ is equal to the restriction of the distribution associated to T_Ω and the distribution associated to $T_{\Omega'}$.
So let C be a closed foliated current and $\{\Omega_i\}_i$ a regular atlas for $\mathcal{F}$. For every i choose a differential d–form ω_i compactly supported in some neighborhood of $\Omega_i \simeq L_i \times T_i$ such that $\int_{L(t)} \omega_i = 1$ for every $t \in T_i$. A transverse distribution δ_i on the local transversal T_i is now defined by

$$\langle \delta_i, f\rangle := \langle C, f\omega_i\rangle \quad f \in C^\infty_c(T_i).$$

This definition is independent of the choice of the forms ω_i; in fact if $\int_{L(t)} \omega_i = \int_{L(t)} \omega'_i = 1$ there must be some family $d+1$–forms $t \longmapsto \sigma(t)$ such that $d_{L(t)}\sigma(t) = \omega(t) - \omega'(t)$. This family can be extended to a form σ on Ω_i using the trivial connection. But C is foliated and closed then,

$$\langle C, \omega_i - \omega_i' \rangle = \langle C, d f \sigma \rangle = 0.$$

The independence from the choice of ω_i also proves the relative holonomy invariance in fact, for two distinct sets $\Omega_i \cup \Omega_j$ one can choose ω_{ij} such that $\int_{L_i(t)} \omega_{ij} = \int_{L_j(t)} \omega_{ij} = 1$ for $t \in T_i \cap T_j$.
Viceversa let δ a holonomy invariant transverse distribution relative to a good cover. Define first a closed foliated d–current C_Ω on Ω for every $\Omega_i \simeq L_i \times T_i$ of the cover then patch together using a smooth partition of the unity.
If ω is a compactly supported d–form on Ω define

$$\langle C_\Omega, \omega \rangle := \left\langle \delta, \int_L \omega_{|F} \right\rangle,$$

in other words we let δ act on the function on T defined by $t \longmapsto \int_{L(t)} \omega_F(l,t)$. This collection of local currents is coherent with intersections by means of the holonomy invariance in fact $C_\Omega = C_{\Omega'}$ on $\Omega \cap \Omega'$. Furthermore every C_Ω is closed since

$$\langle C_\Omega, d\omega \rangle = \langle \delta_T, \int_L d\omega_{|F} \rangle = \langle \delta_T, 0 \rangle$$

The property of being foliated is immediate since by costruction they depend only on the values of the forms on the foliation. □

REMARK — Actually there is also another interesting geometric definition of a holonomy invariant measure as a (Radon) measure on X that is invariant in the direction of the leaves i.e. a measures on the ambient manifold that is invariant under flows generated by vector fields tangent to the foliation. Also a notion of distribution invariant in the direction of the leaves can be defined (see [26]).

To complete the picture one has to speak about positivity. Recall that our foliation is oriented.

DEFINITION 4.15 — A closed d–current C is positive in the direction of the leaves if $\langle C, \omega \rangle \geq 0$ for every d–form that restricts to a positive form on the leaves.

THEOREM 4.15 — Is equivalent to give on an manifold X with an oriented foliation

1. A holonomy invariant transverse measure i.e. a (Radon) measure on the σ–ring of all transversals invariant under the action of the holonomy pseudogroup Γ.
2. A measure on X invariant in the direction of the leaves.
3. A closed foliated current positive in the direction of the leaves.

PROOF — Apart for the case of invariant measures on X that are positive in the direction of the leaves for whose we make reference to [26] the only observation to do here is that a foliated current that is positive in the direction of the leaves defines a positive transverse distribution.
□

4.2.2 Tangential cohomology

Let $\Lambda^k T^*\mathcal{F}$ the bundle of exterior k–powers of the cotangent bundle of the foliation. In the terminology of Moore and Schochet this is a tangential vector bundle i.e. it has a canonical foliation compatible with the vector bundle structure. In a local trivialization over a foliated chart

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \wedge^k T^*\mathcal{F} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\pi"'] & U \times \mathbb{R}^{\binom{p}{k}} \arrow[dl] \\
L \times T \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & U &
\end{tikzcd}$$

this foliation is given by the product foliation $\left(L \times \mathbb{R}^{\binom{p}{q}}\right) \times T$, in particular the bundle projection maps leaves into leaves.

Definition 4.16 — A continuous section of $\wedge^k T^*\mathcal{F}$ is called a tangential k differential form if in every trivialization as above it restricts to be a smooth section on every plaque $L \times \{t\}$. The space of tangential k–differential forms is denoted with $\Omega^k_\tau(X)$ and $\Omega^k_{\tau,c}(X)$ is the subspace of the compactly supported ones.

In a foliated chart with leafwise cordinates $x_1, ..., x_p$ and transversal coordinate t, a tangentially smooth differential form can be written

$$\omega = \sum_{i_l} a_{i_l}(x_1, ..., x_p, t) dx_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge dx_{i_k} \tag{18}$$

with a_{i_l} and all of its derivatives w.r.t. $x_1, ..., x_p$ continuous in all its variables. One can hence form the tangential De Rham operator $d_\tau : \Omega^k_{\tau c}(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^k_{\tau c}(X)$ just applying the standard de Rham operator plaque by plaque. We have defined the complex $(\Omega^*_{\tau c}(X), d_\tau)$ of tangential forms with compact support (d_τ is an example of leafwise differential operator, it decrease supports).

Definition 4.17 — The homology of the complex $(\Omega^*_{\tau c}(X), d_\tau)$ is called the tangential cohomology with compact support and denoted by $H^*_{\tau c}(X)$.

We can naturally define also tangential cohomology starting with forms without the condition of compactness of the support. In general the tangential cohomology has infinite dimension this is due to the fact that the continuous transverse control is much more relaxing than smoothness in every direction. In fact there is an interesting question on how the dimension of these spaces changes passing from tangential continuity (also measurability) to smoothness. In Chapter III of [65] there are examples of these phenomena. In the case the foliation is given by the fibers of a trivially local fiber bundle $F \hookrightarrow M \longrightarrow X$ the tangential cohomology turns out to be naturally isomorphic to the space of continuous sections of the bundle $H \longrightarrow X$ where the fiber $H_x = H^*_{\mathrm{dR}}(M_x)$ is the de Rham cohomology of the fiber above x.
Let's topologize each space $\Omega^\bullet_{\tau c}(X)$ by requiring uniform convergence of every coefficient function a_{i_l} in (18) with its tangential derivatives in every compact subset of each foliated chart. It often happens that the topological vector space $H^\bullet_{\tau c}(X)$ is not Hausdorff; this is the reason why it is convenient to take its maximal Haudorff quotient to define the closed tangential cohomology[9]

$$\overline{H}^k_\tau(X) := H^k_\tau(X)/\overline{\{0\}} = \mathrm{Ker}(d_\tau : \Omega^k_{\tau c} \longrightarrow \Omega^{k+1}_{\tau c})/\overline{\mathrm{Range}(d_\tau : \Omega^{k-1}_{\tau c} \longrightarrow \Omega^k_{\tau c})}.$$

---

[9] sometimes called the tangential reduced cohomology

In general this leads to different spaces, for the irrational flow on the torus $\overline{H}^1_\tau(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{R}) \cong \mathbb{R}$ while $H^1_\tau(\mathbb{T},\mathbb{R})$ is infinite dimensional ([65]).

DEFINITION 4.18 — Elements of the topological dual of $\Omega^\bullet_{\tau c}(X)$ i.e. continuous linear functionals $C : \Omega^\bullet_{\tau c}(X) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are called tangential currents. The space of tangential currents is denoted by

$$\Omega^\tau_k := \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{con.}}(\Omega^k_{\tau c}(X);\mathbb{C}).$$

Note that a foliated current of definition 4.13 is a current in the ordinary sense that passes to define a tangential current under the restriction morphism $(\cdot)_{|\mathcal{F}} : \Omega^k(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^k_\tau(X)$. The differential $d_\tau : \Omega^\bullet_\tau(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^{\bullet+1}_\tau(X)$ (we will omit the subscript τ by simplicity of notation) is continuous and extends by duality to currents, $d_* : \Omega^\tau_\bullet(X) \longrightarrow \Omega^\tau_{\bullet-1}(X)$ according to the sign convention $\langle \omega, d_* \rangle = (-1)^{k-1}\langle d_\tau \omega, c\rangle$. There is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{con.}}(H^k_{\tau c}(X);\mathbb{R}) \cong H^\tau_k(X;\mathbb{R})$$

and theorem 4.5, page 30 is essentially the Ruelle–Sullivan isomorphism[10]

$$\mathrm{MT}(X) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{con.}}(H^p_{\tau c},\mathbb{R})$$

between the vector space of signed holonomy invariant transverse Radon measures and the topological dual space of the top degree tangential homology. The tangential current defined by a measure Λ is called the Ruelle Sullivan current C_Λ.

4.2.3 Transverse measures and non commutative integration theory

Up to this point we have used the name *transverse measure* for at least two objects; measures on the union of all transversals and transverse measures in the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ (or the holonomy groupoid, G) according to definition 4.1. In the rest of the section we clarify the relationship between them. First we need a couple of additional definitions

DEFINITION 4.19 — A transverse measure Λ in the sense of non commutative integration theory for the equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}$ (or the holonomy groupoid G) is called locally finite if $\Lambda(\nu) < \infty$ for every $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ having the following two properties

1. ν is locally bounded i.e. $\sup \nu^x(K) < \infty$ for every K compact in $\mathcal{R}$
2. ν is compactly supported i.e. ν^x is supported in $s^{-1}(K)$ for a compact $K \subset X$.

DEFINITION 4.20 — The characteristic function ν_A of a subset $A \subset X$ is the transverse function defined by $\nu^x_A(B) = |s^{-1}(A) \cap G^x \cap B|$ or equivalently $\nu(f)(y) := \sum_{\gamma \in G^y,\, s(\gamma)\in A} f(\gamma)$ for a Borel function f on G.

Note that the characteristic function is nothing but the lift $s^{-1}(\mu_A)$ of the counting measure concentrated in A. This actually shows that $\gamma\nu^x_A = \nu^y_A$, $\gamma \in G^y_x$.

THEOREM 4.20 — (Connes [26]) Let Λ be a locally finite transverse measure for $\mathcal{R}$ (G). Let Z

---

[10] at this level this is only a vector space iso. but one can consider the $*$–weak topology on the space of measures to force this to be a topological iso. However we don't need continuity.

a transverse submanifold; for a compact set $K \subset Z$ define $\tau(K) := \Lambda(\nu_K)$. This is the definition of a Positive Radon measure on Z that is holonomy invariant.
In other words the correspondence $\Lambda \longmapsto \tau$ is a bijection

$\{$Locally finite transverse measures on $\mathcal{R}\} \longrightarrow \{$Holonomy invariant transverse measures on $X\}$.

Remember that there is a coupling between transverse measures Λ on $\mathcal{R}$ and transverse functions ν to produce a measure on X defined by $\Lambda_\nu(f) = \Lambda((s \circ f)\nu)$ then

$$\Lambda_{\nu_K}(1) = \Lambda(\nu_k) = \tau(K).$$

Definition 4.21 — Choose some Radon measure α on the ambient manifold X; call the lift of α the transverse measure $\nu^x := s^*(\alpha)$ where $s : G^x \longrightarrow X$. We say that a lift is transversally measurable if for every foliated chart $\Omega \cong U \times T$ it is represented as a weakly measurable mapping $T \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ra}(U)$ from T to the space of Radon measures on U, bounded if Ω is relatively compact.

Proposition 4.22 — (Connes [26]) The map $\alpha \longmapsto s^*(\alpha)$ is a bijection between transversally measurable Radon measures on X and transverse functions ν suc that $\sup \nu(K) < \infty$ for every compact $K \subset G$.

Proposition 4.23 — Choose some Radon measure α on X with support X. Let $\nu = s^*(\alpha)$. The mapping $\Lambda \longmapsto \Lambda_\nu$ is a bijection between locally finite transverse measures on G and Radon measures μ on X with the property:
for every disintegration of μ on a foliated chart along the fibers of the distinct mapping $\Omega \cong U \times T \longrightarrow T$ the conditional measures satisfy

$$d\mu_t = d\alpha_t.$$

In practice the above propositions furnishes a geometrical recipe to recognize the measure Λ_ν on the base X if Λ is a transverse measure on the foliation i.e. a measure on the σ–ring of all Borel transversals. In fact choose some foliated atlas $\Omega_i \simeq U_i \times T_i$ with the set of coordinates (x, t) and a subordinate smooth partition of the unit φ_i. Then for a function f

$$\Lambda_\nu(f) = \sum_i \int_{T_i} \int_{U_i} \varphi_i(x,t) f(x,t) d\nu_t(x) d\Lambda_{T_i}(t)$$

where $\nu_t(x)$ is the longitudinal measure ν restricted to the plaque $U_i \times \{t\}$. We shall refer to this Fubini type decomposition as to the integration process according to the terminology of the book by Moore and Schochet [65].

4.3 Von Neumann algebras and Breuer Fredholm theory for foliations

Let $\mathcal{R}$ the equivalence relation of the foliation. For square integrable representations on the measurable fields of Hilbert spaces H_i let $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(H_1, H_2)$ the vector space of all intertwining operators. The choice of a holonomy invariant measure Λ on the foliation gives rise to a transverse measure on $\mathcal{R}$ in the sence of non commutative integration theory hence a quotient projection

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(H_1, H_2) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2)$$

given by identification modulo Λ-a.e. equality. Elements of $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2)$ are called Random operators. If $H_1 = H_2 = H$, then $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(H, H) = \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(H)$ is an involutive algebra, the quotient via Λ is a Von Neumann algebra[11]

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(H) \longrightarrow \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(H).$$

For a vector bundle $E \longrightarrow X$ let $L^2(E)$ be the Borel field of Hilbert spaces on X, fixed by the leafwise square integrable sections $\{L^2(L_x, E_{|L_x})\}_{x\in X}$. There is a natural square integrable representation of $\mathcal{R}$ on $L^2(E)$ the one given by $(x, y) \longmapsto \mathrm{Id} : L^2(L_x, E) \longrightarrow L^2(L_y, E)$. Denote $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(E)$ the vectorspace of all intertwining operators and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(E)$ the corresponding Von Neumann algebra.
Since we need unbounded operators we have to define measurability for fields of closed unbounded operators. Remember that the polar decomposition $T = u|T|$ is determined by the couple of bounded operators u and $(1 + T^*T)^{-1}$.

DEFINITION 4.24 — We say that a field of unbounded closed operators T_x is measurable if are measurable the fields of bounded operators u_x and $(1 + T_x^*T_x)^{-1}$.

REMARK — .In the paper [68] about unbounded reduction theory. An unbounded field of closed operators A is said measurable if the family corresponding to the projection on the graph is measurable on $H \oplus H$ with the direct sum measure structure. Writing the projection on the graph as

$$(\xi, \eta) \longmapsto ((1 + A^*A)^{-1}(\xi + A^*\eta), A(1 + A^*A)^{-1}(\xi + A^*\eta))$$

we can see that these definition is equivalent to the one given here

Next, we review some ingredients from Breuer theory of Fredholm operators on Von Neumann algebras, adapted to our weight–theory case with some notions translated in the language of the essential Λ–spectrum, a straightforward generalization of the essential spectrum of a self–adjoint operator. Main references are [16, 17] and [20] and [21].

Remember that the set of projections $\mathcal{P} := \{A \in \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E), A^* = A, A^2 = A\}$ of a Von Neumann algebra, has the structure of a complete lattice i.e. for every family $\{A_i\}_i$ of projections one can form their join $\vee A_i$ and their meet $\wedge A_i$. Then for a random operator $A \in \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E)$ we can define its projection on the range $R(A) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E))$ and the projection on its kernel $N(A) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E))$ according to $R(A) := \vee\{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E)) : PA = A\}$ and $N(A) := \wedge\{P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E)) : PA = P\}$. If A is the class of the measurable field of operators A_x, it is clear that $R(A)$ and $N(A)$ are the classes of $R(A)_x$ and $N(A)_x$.

DEFINITION 4.25 — Let H_i, $i = 1, .., 3$ be square integrable representations of $\mathcal{R}$ define

1. Λ–finite rank random operators. $B^f_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2) := \{A \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2) : \mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}\, R(A) < \infty\}$

---

[11] to be precise this is a W^* algebra in fact it is not naturally represented on some Hilbert space. The choice of a longitudinal measure ν gives however a representation $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(H) \longrightarrow B(\int_X H_x d\Lambda_\nu(x))$ on the direct integral of the field H_x

2. Λ–compact random operators. $B^{\infty}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2)$ is the norm closure of finite rank operators.
3. Λ–Hilbert–Schmidt random operators

$$B^2_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2) := \{A \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2) : \mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}(A^*A) < \infty\}.$$

4. Λ–trace class operators. $B^1_{\Lambda}(H) = B^2_{\Lambda}(H)B^2_{\Lambda}(H)^* = \{\sum_{i=1}^n S_iT_i^* : S_i, T_i \in B^2_{\Lambda}(H)\}$.

Lemma 4.26 — Let $* = f, 1, 2, \infty$. $B^*_{\Lambda}(H)$ is a $*$–ideal in $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E)$. An element $A \in B^*_{\Lambda}(H)$ iff $|A| \in B^*_{\Lambda}(H)$. The following inclusion holds

$$B^f_{\Lambda}(E) \subset B^1_{\Lambda}(E) \subset B^2_{\Lambda}(E) \subset B^{\infty}_{\Lambda}(E).$$

Furthermore

$$B^1_{\Lambda}(E) = \{A \in \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(E) : \mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda} |A| < \infty\}.$$

Proof— The proof is very similar to the standard case. □

An important inequality is the following, take $A \in B^1_{\Lambda}(E)$ and $C \in \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(H)$. We have polar decompositions $A = U|A|$, $C = V|C|$ then $|A| = U^*A \in B^1_{\Lambda}(E)$, $|A|^{1/2} \in B^2_{\Lambda}(E)$ and

$$|\,\mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}(CA)| \leq \|C\| \,\mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda} |A|. \tag{19}$$

For the proof being a very standard calculation in Von Neumann algebras, can be found in chapter V of [89].

Definition 4.27 — A random operator $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(E_1, E_2)$ is Λ–Fredholm (Breuer–Fredholm) if there exist $G \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(E_2, E_1)$ such that $FG - \mathrm{Id} \in B^{\infty}_{\Lambda}(E_2)$ and $GF - \mathrm{Id} \in B^{\infty}_{\Lambda}(E_1)$.

Definition 4.28 — For an unbounded field of closed operators $T_x : H_1 \longrightarrow H_2$ between two measurable fields of Hilbert spaces H_i the field of bounded operators

$$T_x : (\mathrm{Domain}(T_x), \|\cdot\|_{T_x}) \longrightarrow H_2$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{T_x}$ is the graph norm is measurable by Remark 4.3. We say that T is Λ–Breuer–Fredholm when this field of bounded operators is Λ–Breuer–Fredholm.

Proposition 4.29 — A random operator $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\Lambda}(H_1, H_2)$ is Λ–Fredholm if and only if $N(F)$ is Λ–finite rank and there exist some finite rank projection $S \in \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(H_2)$ such that $R(\mathrm{Id} - S) \subset R(F)$.

Hence from the proposition above Λ–Fredholm operators F have a finite Λ–index. In fact $\mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}(N(F)) < \infty$ and

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}(1 - R(F)) \leq \mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda}(S) < \infty,$$

making clear the next definition.

DEFINITION 4.30 — Let $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(H_1, H_2)$ be Λ–Fredholm. The Λ index of F is defined by

$$\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(F) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(N(F)) - \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(1 - R(F)).$$

The next result in The Shubin book by Shubin [84], motivates the definition of an useful instrument called the Λ–essential spectrum

LEMMA 4.31 — Let M be a Von Neumann algebra endowed with a semi–finite faithful trace τ, $S = S^* \in M$. Then S is τ–Breuer–Fredholm if and only if there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\tau(E(-\epsilon, \epsilon)) < \infty$, where $E(\Delta)$ is the spectral projection of S corresponding to a Borel set Δ. Besides if $S = S^*$ is τ–Breuer–Fredholm then $\mathrm{ind}_\tau S = 0$.

So consider a measurable field T of unbounded intertwining operators. If T is selfadjoint (every T_x is self–adjoint a.e.) the parametrized (measurable) spectral Theorem (cf. Theorem XIII.85 in [77]) shows that for every bounded Borel function f the family $x \longmapsto f(T_x)$ is a measurable field of uniformely bounded intertwining operators defining a unique random operator. In other words

$$\{f(T_x)\}_x \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H).$$

For a Borel set $U \subset \mathbb{R}$ let $\chi_T(U)$ be the family of spectral projections $x \longmapsto \chi_U(T_x)$. Denote $H_T(U)$ the measurable field of Hilbert spaces corresponding to the family of the images $(H_T(U))_x = \chi_U(T)H_x$. Let $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda : \mathrm{End}^+_\Lambda(H) \longrightarrow [0, +\infty]$ the semifinite normal faithful trace defined by Λ. The formula

$$\mu_{\Lambda,T}(U) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\chi_T(U)) = \dim_\Lambda(H_U(T))$$

defines a Borel measure on $\mathbb{R}$.

DEFINITION 4.32 — We call the Borel measure defined above the Λ–spectral measure of T.

REMARK — Clearly this is not in general a Radon measure (i.e. finite on compact sets). In fact due to the non–compactness of the ambient manifold a spectral projection of a relatively compact set of an (even elliptic) operator is not trace class. In the case of elliptic self adjoint operators with spectrum bounded by below this is the Lebesgue–Stiltijes measure associated with the spectrum distribution function relative to the Λ–trace. This is the (not decreasing) function $\lambda \longmapsto \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda\, \chi_{(-\infty,\lambda)}(T)$. A good reference on this subject is the work of Kordyukov [47].

Notice the formula

$$\int f d\mu_{\Lambda,T} = \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(f(T))$$

for each bounded Borel function $f : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow [0, \infty)$. The proof of this fact easily follows starting from characteristic functions. Here the normality property of the trace plays a fundamental role. A detailed argument can be found in [70]. Next we introduce, inspired by [93] the *main character* of this section.

DEFINITION 4.33 — The essential Λ–spectrum of the measurable field of unbounded self–adjoint operators T is

$$\mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(T) := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{R} : \mu_{\Lambda,T}(\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon) = \infty, \forall \epsilon > 0\}.$$

Lemma 4.34 — For Random operators the Λ–essential spectrum is stable under compact perturbation. If $A \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(E)$ is selfadjoint $A = A^*$ and $S = S^* \in B^\infty_\Lambda(E)$ then

$$\mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(A + S) = \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(A).$$

Then if tr_Λ is infinite i.e. $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(1) = \infty$ we have $\mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(A) = \{0\}$ for every $A = A^* \in B^\infty_\Lambda(E)$.

Proof— Let $\lambda \in \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(A)$, by definition $\dim_\Lambda H_A(\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon) = \infty$. Then consider the field of Hilbert spaces

$$G_{\epsilon,x} := \big\{t \in \chi_{(-\lambda-\epsilon,\lambda+\epsilon)}(A_x)H_x;\ \|S_x t\| < \epsilon\|t\|\big\} = H_{S_x}(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \cap H_{A_x}(-\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon).$$

This actually shows that G_ϵ is Λ–finite dimensional in fact $H_{A_x}(-\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon)$ is Λ–infinite dimensional while $H_{S_x}(-\epsilon, \epsilon)$ is Λ–finite codimensional. This shows that $\lambda \in \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(A + S)$. The second statement is immediate. □

There is a spectral characterization of Λ–Fredholm random operators as expected after Lemma [?].

Proposition 4.35 — For a random operator $F \in \mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(H_1, H_2)$ the following are equivalent

1. F is Λ–Fredholm.
2. $0 \notin \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(F^*F)$ and $0 \notin \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(FF^*)$.
3. $0 \notin \mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & F^* \\ F & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
4. $N(F)$ is Λ–finite rank and there exist some finite rank projection $S \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H_2)$ such that $R(\mathrm{Id} - S) \subset R(F)$.

4.3.1 The splitting principle

Let $E \longrightarrow X$ be a vector bundle. For every $x \in X$ and integer k consider the Sobolev space $H^k(L_x, E)$ of sections of E, obtained by completion of $C^\infty_c(L_x, E)$ with respect to the k Sobolev norm

$$\|s\|^2_{H^k(L_x;E)} := \sum_{i=0}^{k} \|\nabla^k s\|^2_{L^2(\otimes^k T^* L_x;E)},$$

here the longitudinal Levi Civita connection w.r.t. the metric has been used. This is the definition of a Borel field of Hilbert spaces with natural Borel structure given by the inclusion into L^2. In fact, by Proposition 4 of Dixmier [31] p.167 to prescribe a measure structure on a field of hilbert spaces H it is enough to give a countable sequence $\{s_j\}$ of sections with the property that for $x \in X$ the countable set $\{s_j(x)\}$ is complete orthonormal. In the appendix of Heitsch and Lazarov paper [38] is shown, making use of holonomy that a family with the property that each s_j is smooth and compactly supported on each leaf can be choosen.

Definition 4.36 — Consider a field $T = \{T_x\}_{x\in X}$ (not necessarily Borel by now) of continuous intertwining operators $T_x : C^\infty_c(L_x; E_{|L_x}) \longrightarrow C^\infty_c(L_x; E_{|L_x})$.

- We say that T is of order $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ if T_x extends to a bounded operator
$$H^m(L_x, E_{|Lx}) \longrightarrow H^{m-k}(L_x, E_{|Lx})$$
for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and for x a.e.
- We say that the T is elliptic if each T_x satisfies a Gärding type inequality
$$\|s\|_{H_x^{m+k}} \leq C(L_x, m, k)[\|s\|_{H_x^m} + \|T_x s\|_{H_x^m}],$$
and the family $\{C(L_x, m, k)\}_{x \in X}$ is bounded outside a null set in X.

Since each leaf L_x is a manifold with bounded geometry for a family of elliptic selfadjoint intertwining operators $\{T_x\}_{x \in X}$ every T_x is essentially selfadjoint with domain $H^k(L_x; E_{|L_x})$. It makes sense again to speak of measurability of such a family.

DEFINITION 4.37 — For two fields of operators P and P' say that $P = P'$ outside a compact $K \subset X$ if for every leaf L_x and every section $s \in C_c^\infty(L_x \setminus K; E)$ then $Ps = P's$. This property holding x a.e in X with respect to the standard Lebesgue measure class.

THEOREM 4.37 — The splitting principle. Let P and P' two Borel fields of (unbounded) selfadjoint order 1 elliptic intertwining operators. If $P = P'$ outside a compact set $K \subset X$ then
$$\operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(P) = \operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(P').$$

PROOF— Let $\lambda \in \operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(P)$, for each $\epsilon > 0$ put $\chi_\epsilon^\lambda := \chi_{(\lambda-\epsilon,\lambda+\epsilon)}$ and $G_\epsilon := \chi_\epsilon^\lambda(P)$, then $\operatorname{tr}_\Lambda(G_\epsilon) = \infty$. The projection G_ϵ amounts to the Borel field of projections $\{\chi_\epsilon^\lambda(P_x)\}_{x \in X}$. By elliptic regularity on each Hilbert space $G_{\epsilon,x}$ every Sobolev norm is equivalent in fact the spectral theorem and Gårding inequality show that for $s \in G_{\epsilon,x}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$
$$\|s\|_{H_x^{k+2}} \leq C(P_1, k+2)\{\|s\|_{L_x^2} + \|(P_1 - \lambda)^k s\|_{L_x^2}\} \leq (C + \epsilon^k)\|s\|_{L_x^2}$$
where $C(P_1, k+2)$ is a constant bigger than each leafwise Gårding constant.
Now choose two cut–off functions $\phi, \psi \in C_c^\infty(X)$ with $\phi_K = 1$ and $\psi_{|\operatorname{supp}\phi} = 1$. Consider the following fields of operators
$$B_\phi : L_x^2 \xrightarrow{\chi_\lambda^\epsilon} G_{\epsilon,x} \xrightarrow{\phi} L_x^2, \tag{20}$$
$$C_\psi : L_x^2 \xrightarrow{\chi_\lambda^\epsilon} (G_{\epsilon,x}, \|\cdot\|_{L^2}) \longrightarrow (G_{\epsilon,x}, \|\cdot\|_{H^k}) \xrightarrow{\psi} H_x^1 \tag{21}$$
for a k sufficiently big in order to have the Sobolev embedding theorem. We declare that $C_\psi^* C_\psi \in \operatorname{End}_\Lambda(E)$ is Λ–compact. In fact consider by simplicity the case in which ψ is supported in a foliation chart $U \times T$. The integration process shows that the trace of $C_\psi^* C_\psi$ is given by integration on T of the local trace on each plaque $U_t = U \times \{t\}$. Now the operator $C_{\psi,x}^* C_{\psi,x}$ is locally traceable by Theorem 1.10 in Moore and Schochet [65] since by Sobolev embedding the range of C_Ψ is made of continuous sections (the fact that each sobolev norm is equivalent on G_ϵ makes the teorem appliable i.e don't care in forming the adjoint w.r.t. H^1 norm or L^2). These local traces are uniformly bounded in $U \times T$ from the uniformity of the

Gårding constants for the family since we are multiplying by a compactly supported function ψ. Actually we have shown that $C_\psi^* C_\psi$ is Λ–trace class. There follows from Lemma 4.34 about Λ–compact operators that the projection $\widetilde{G}_\epsilon := \chi_{(-\epsilon^2,\epsilon^2)}(C_\psi^* C_\psi)$ is Λ–infinite dimensional; in fact

$$\operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(C_\psi^* C_\psi) = \{0\}.$$

Now $1 - B_\phi$ is Λ–Fredholm (B_ϕ is Λ–compact) then its kernel has finite Λ–dimension. Also since $C_\psi^* C_\psi \chi_\epsilon^\lambda = C_\psi^* C_\psi$ then $\widetilde{G}_\epsilon \chi_\epsilon^\lambda = \tilde{G}_\epsilon$ hence $(1 - B_\phi)\tilde{G}_\epsilon = (1-\phi)\tilde{G}_\epsilon \subset \operatorname{domain}(P')$ is Λ–infinite dimensional.
Take $s \in \tilde{G}_\epsilon$, from the definition

$$\|\psi s\|_{H^1}^2 = \langle C_\psi s, C_\psi s\rangle_{H^1} = \langle C_\psi^* C_\psi s, s\rangle_{L^2} \leq \epsilon^2 \|s\|_{L^2}^2$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\|(P'-\lambda)(1-\phi)s\|_{L^2} \leq \|[P,\phi]s\|_{L^2} + \|(1-\phi)(P-\lambda)s\|_{L^2} \leq C\|\psi s\|_{H^1} + \\ \|(P-\lambda)s\|_{L^2} \leq \epsilon(1+C)\|s\|_{L^2}.\end{aligned}$$

The second chain of inequalities follows from

$$\begin{aligned}(P'-\lambda)(1-\phi)s = (P-\lambda)(1-\phi)s = ([P-\lambda, 1-\phi] - (1-\phi)(P-\lambda))s \\ = -([P,\phi] + (1-\phi)(P-\lambda))s.\end{aligned}$$

Finally the spectral theorem for (unbounded) self adjoint operators shows that

$$(1-\phi)\tilde{G}_\epsilon \subset \chi_{(\sigma,\tau)}(P')$$

with $\sigma = \lambda - \epsilon(1+C), \tau = \lambda + \epsilon(1+C)$. In particular $\lambda \in \operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(P')$. □

Corollary 4.38 — Consider two foliated manifolds X and Y (with cylindrical ends or bounded geometry) with holonomy invariant measures Λ_1, Λ_2 and bounded geometry vector bundles $E_1 \longrightarrow X$ and $E_2 \longrightarrow Y$. Suppose there exist compact sets $K_1 \subset X$ and $K_2 \subset Y$ such that outside $X \setminus K_1$ and $Y \setminus K_2$ are isometric with an isometry that identifyies every geometric structure as the bundles and the foliation with the transverse measure. If P and P' are operators as in Theorem 4.7, page 38 with $P = P'$ on $X \setminus K_1 \simeq Y \setminus K_2$ in the sense of definition 4.37 then

$$\operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda_1,e}(P) = \operatorname{spec}_{\Lambda_2,e}(P').$$

Proof— The proof of 4.7, page 38 can be repeated word by word till the introduction of the element $(1-\phi)\tilde{G}_\epsilon$ that can be considered as an element of $\operatorname{End}_{\Lambda_2}(E_2)$ through the fixed isometry. □

5 Analysis of the Dirac operator

5.1 Finite dimensionality of the index problem

Consider the leafwise Dirac operator D. This is a measurable field of unbounded first order differential operators $\{D_x\}_{x\in X}$. Its measurability property is easily checked observing that is equivalent to prove the measurability of the field of bounded operators

$$(D_x + i)^{-1} : L^2(L_x; E) \longrightarrow H^1(L_x; E).$$

Here the field of natural Sobolev spaces has the canonical structure given by inclusion into L^2. Now, the self–adjointness of D_x with domain $H^1(L_x;E)$ shows that

$$(D_x+i):H^1(L_x;E)\longrightarrow L^2(L_x;E)$$

is a Hilbert space isomorphism. Choose two sections s,t of the domain and range respectively with the additional property that are smooth when restricted to each leaf then

$$\langle (D_x+i)s(x),t(x)\rangle_{L^2(L_x;E)}=\langle s(x),(D_x-i)t(x)\rangle_{L^2(L_x;E)}$$

and the measurability of the right–hand side is clear. Now it remains to apply the Example 2. in Dixmier [31] p-157 to have that the leafwise inverse family is measurable (Borel)[12].

Since the foliation is even dimensional there is a canonical involution $\tau=i^pc(e_1\cdots e_{2p})$ giving a parallel hortonormal ±1 eigenbundles splitting $E=E^+\oplus E^-$. Moreover the Dirac operator is odd with respect to this splitting. That's to say that D anticommutes with τ, giving a pair of first order leafwise differential elliptic operators $D_x^\pm:C_c^\infty(L_x;E^\pm)\longrightarrow C_c^\infty(L_x;E^\mp)$. We continue to use the same notation for their unique L^2–closure and we have $D=D^+\oplus D^-$ with $D^+=(D^-)^*$.

The operator D^+ is called the chiral longitudinal Dirac operator, in general this is not a Breuer–Fredholm operator. In fact Fredholm properties are governed by its behavior at the boundary i.e its restriction to the base of the cylinder ∂X_0. In the one leaf situation D^+ is Fredholm in the usual sense if and only if 0 is not in the continuous spectrum of D^-D^+ or equivalently if the continuous spectrum has a positive lower bound. However what is still true in this case is that the L^2 kernels of D^+ and D^- are finite dimensional and made of smooth sections. The difference

$$\dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)-\dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^-)$$

is by definition the L^2–chiral index of D^+. It gives the usual fredholm index when the operator is Fredholm. Notice that in the non Fredholm case the L^2 index is not stable under compactly supported perturbations. This is one of the most difficulties in its computation.

We are going to show that in our foliation case the chiral index problem is Λ–finite dimensional in the following sense.

- By an application of the parametrized measurable spectral theorem the projections on the L^2–kernels of $D^\pm$ belong to the Von Neumann algebras of the corresponding bundles, $\chi_{\{0\}}(D^+)\in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(\mathrm{E}^\pm)$ and decompose as a Borel family of bounded operators $\{\chi_{\{0\}}(D^\pm)_x\}_x$ corresponding to the projections on the L^2 kernels of $D_x^\pm$. Furthermore they are implemented by a Borel family of uniformly smoothing Schwartz kernels.
- The family of projections above give rise to a longitudinal measure on the foliation. These measure are the local traces $U\longmapsto \mathrm{tr}_{L^2(L_x)}[\chi_U\cdot\chi_{\{0\}}(D^\pm)_x\cdot\chi_U]$ where for a Borel $U\subset L_x$ the operator χ_U acts on $L^2(L_x)$ by multiplication. In terms of the smooth longitudinal Riemannian density these measures are represented by the pointwise traces of the leafwise Schwartz kernels. We prove that these local traces has the following finiteness property completely analog to the Radon property for compact foliated spaces.

Finiteness property for local traces of projections on the kernel.

---

[12] The example simply states that the family of the inverses of a Borel family of Hilbert space isomorphisms is Borel

Consider a leaf L_x. This is a bounded geometry manifold with a cylindrical end $\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+$. We claim that for every compact $K \subset \partial L_x$

$$\mathrm{tr}_{L^2(L_x)}[\chi_{K\times\mathbb{R}^+}\cdot\chi_{\{0\}}(D^{\pm})_x\cdot\chi_{K\times\mathbb{R}^+}] < \infty \tag{22}$$

Since this list of items is aimed to the definition of the index, the (rather long) proof of inequality (22) statement is postponed immediately after. We limit ourselves here to say that is the relevant form of *elliptic regularity* in our situation.

- The integration process of a longitudinal measure against a transverse holonomy invariant measure immediately shows that the integrability condition above is sufficient to assure finite Λ–dimensionality of the L^2 kernels of $D^{\pm}$. Here is the proof.

  First one has to choose a complete compact transversal S and a Borel map $f : X \longrightarrow S$ that respects the leaf equivalence relation displaying X as measure–theoretically fibering over S. Thanks to our assuptions on the foliation we can choose S composed by two pieces S_1 and S_2 where $S_1 = \partial X_0 \times \{0\}$ on the cylinder while S_2 is an *interior* transversal. Since we are working in the Borel world we can surely think that f restricts to U with values on S_1 and outside U with values on S_2. Now the integral has two terms. The first integral, on S_1 is finite thanks to the finiteness property above in fact the situation here is a fibered integral of a standard Radon measure on the base times a finite measure. The interior term is finite thanks to proposition 4.22 in [65].

- **Definition 5.39** — Define the chiral Λ–L^2–index

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\chi_{\{0\}}(D^+)) - \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\chi_{\{0\}}(D^-)) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Proof of finiteness property of the local trace of kernel projections

Proof — It is clear that it suffices to prove the property for each operator $(\cdot)_{|\partial_x\times\mathbb{R}^+}\chi_{\{0\}}(D^+_x)$. Let us consider the operator D^+ on a fixed leaf L_x. This is a bounded geometry manifold with a cylindrical end $\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+ = \{y \in L_x : r(y) \geq 1\}$ where the operator can be written in the form $B + \partial/\partial t$ acting on sections of $F \longrightarrow \partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+$. The boundary operator B is essentially selfadjoint on $L^2(\partial L_x; F)$ on the complete manifold ∂L_x (see [24] and [23] for a proof of self–adjointness using finite propagation speed tecniques).
We are going to remind the Browder–Gårding type generalized eigenfunction expansion for B (see [30] 11, 300–307, [32] and [76] for an application to a A.P.S foliated and Galois covering index problems).
According to Browder–Gårding there exist

1. A sequence of smooth sectional maps $e_j : \mathbb{R} \times \partial L_x \longrightarrow F$ i.e. e_j is measurable and for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $e_j(\lambda, \cdot)$ is a smooth section of F over ∂L_x such that $Be_j(\lambda, x) = \lambda e_j(\lambda, x)$.

2. A sequence of measures μ_j on $\mathbb{R}$ such that the map $V : C^\infty_c(\partial L_x; F) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_j L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_j)$ defined by $(Vs)_j(\lambda) = \langle s, e_j(\lambda, \cdot)\rangle_{L^2(\partial L_x)}$ (integration w.r.t Riemannian density) extends to an Hilbert space isometry

$$V : L^2(\partial L_x; F) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_j L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_j) =: \mathcal{H}_B$$

> which intertwines Borel spectral functions $f(B)$ with the operator defined by multiplication by $f(\lambda)$ with domain given by $\operatorname{dom} f(B) = \Big\{ s : \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} |f(\lambda)|^2 |(Vs)_j(\lambda)|^2 d\mu_j(\lambda) < \infty \Big\}$. In particular beying an isometry means $\displaystyle\int_{\partial L_x} |s(x)|^2 dg = \sum_j \int_{\mathbb{R}} |(Vs)_j|^2 d\mu_j(\lambda)$.

Notice that $e_j(\lambda, \cdot)$ need not be square integrable on L_x. Taking tensor product with $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have the isomorphism

$$L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+, F) \simeq L^2(\partial L_x, F) \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\sim} [\oplus_j L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mu_j)] \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^+) = \mathcal{H}_B \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^+) \quad (23)$$

where $R^+ = (0, \infty)_r$. Under the identification $W := V \otimes \mathrm{Id}$ the operator D^+ is sent into $\lambda + \partial_r$ acting on the space $\mathcal{H}_B \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$. Now let s be an L^2–solution of $D_x s = 0$. By elliptic regularity it restricts to the cylinder as an element $s(x, r) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+, H^\infty(\partial L_x; F)) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; L^2(\partial L_x, F))$ solution of $(\partial_r + B)s = 0$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_r (Vs)_j(\lambda, t) &= \partial_r \int_{\partial L_x} \langle s(x, r), e_j(x, r) \rangle dg = \int_{\partial L_x} \langle dr\, s(x, r), e_j(\lambda, x) \rangle dg \\ &= -\int_{\partial L_x} \langle Bs(x, r), e_j(\lambda, x) \rangle dg = \int_{\partial L_x} \langle s(x, r), Be_j(x, r) \rangle dg \\ &= -\lambda \int_{\partial L_x} \langle Bs(x, r), e_j(\lambda, x) \rangle dg = -\lambda (Vs)_j(\lambda, r). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Equation (24) says that all L^2 solutions of $D^+ = 0$ under the representation V on the cylinder are zero $\mu_j(\lambda)$–a.e. for $\lambda \leq 0$ for every j. Decompose, for fixed $a > 0$

$$L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+; F) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{H}_B([-a, a])) \oplus L^2(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathcal{H}_B(\mathbb{R} \setminus [-a, a])) \quad (25)$$

where the notation is $\mathcal{H}_B(\Delta)$ for the spectral projection associated to χ_Δ. Let $\Pi_{\leq a}$ and $\Pi_{>a}$ respectively be the hortogonal projections corresponding to (25). Let $\chi_{\{0\}}(D_x^+)$ be the L^2 projection on the kernel, there's a composition

$$\Pi^a := \Pi_{\leq a} \circ (\cdot)_{|\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+} \circ \chi_{\{0\}}(D_x^+)$$

defined trough

$$\begin{tikzcd} L^2(L_x) \arrow[r] & \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_x^+) \arrow[r] & L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+) \arrow[r] & L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{H}_B([-a, a])). \end{tikzcd} \quad (26)$$

Thanks to the Browder–Garding expansion and equation (24) we can see that elements ξ belonging to the space $\Pi^a L^2(L_x)$ are of the form

$$\xi = \chi_{(0,\infty)}(\lambda) e^{-\lambda t} \zeta_0 \quad (27)$$

with $\zeta_0 = \zeta_{0j} \in H^\infty(\partial L_x; F)$ to be univocally determined using boundary conditions. Formula (27) allows to define[13] the "boundary datas" mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{BD} : \Pi^a L^2(L_x; F) &\longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_B((0, a]) \\ W^{-1}(\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda) \zeta_0 e^{-\lambda t}) &\longmapsto W^{-1}(\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda) \zeta_0) \end{aligned}$$

---

[13] this is clearly inspired by Melrose definition [62] Chapter 6

This is continuous and injective in fact injectivity is obvious while continuity follows at once from

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi\|_{L^2(\partial L_x\times\mathbb{R}^+)} &= \sum_j\int_{\mathbb{R}}\int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda t}|\zeta_{0j}(\lambda)|^2dtd\mu_j(\lambda)\geq\sum_j\int_{[-a,a]}\int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda t}|\zeta_{0j}(\lambda)|^2dtd\mu_j(\lambda)\\ &\geq\sum_j\int_{[-a,a]}\int_0^\infty e^{-2at}|\zeta_{0j}(\lambda)|^2dtd\mu_j(\lambda)=1/(2a)\sum_j\int_{\mathbb{R}}|\chi_{[-a,a]}\zeta_{0j}(\lambda)|^2d\mu_j(\lambda)\\ &=1/(2a)\|\chi_{[-a,a]}\zeta_0\|_{\mathcal{H}_B}.\end{aligned}$$

Now choose an orthonormal basis $s_m=f_m\otimes g_m\in L^2(\partial L_x\times\mathbb{R}^+,F)$ and a compact set of the boundary $A\subset\partial L_x$, then put $\chi_{A^\square}=\chi_{A\times(0,\infty)}(x,r)$. Consider the operator $\chi_{A^\square}\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square}$ acting on $L^2(L_x;F)$, now notice that Π^a acts on s_m via the natural embedding $L^2(\partial L_x)\subset L^2(L_x)$ then

$$\mathrm{tr}(\chi_{A^\square}\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square})=\sum_m\langle\chi_{A^\square}\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square}s_m,s_m\rangle_{L^2(\partial L_x\times\mathbb{R}^+)}. \tag{28}$$

Write $\mathrm{BD}[\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square}s_m]=W^{-1}[\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}]$ hence $[\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square}s_m]=\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}e^{-\lambda t}$. By continuity of BD the sequence $\chi_{(0,a]}\zeta_0^{(m)}$ is bounded. Then (28) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}(\chi_{A^\square}\Pi^a\chi_{A^\square}) &= \sum_m\langle W^{-1}[\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}e^{-\lambda t}],\chi_{A^\square}s_m\rangle\\ &=\sum_m\langle\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}e^{-\lambda t},W(\chi_{A^\square}s_m)\rangle \qquad (29)\end{aligned}$$

$$=\sum_m\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}}\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}e^{-\lambda t}\overline{\Big\{W(\chi_{A^\square}s_m)\Big\}}d\mu(\lambda)dt \tag{30}$$

where μ is the direct sum of the μ_j's.
Last term of (29) can be estimated using Cauchy–Schwartz inequality and the trivial identity

$$\begin{aligned}&W(\chi_{A^\square}s_m)W(\chi_{A^\square}f_m\otimes g_m)=V(\chi_A(x)f_m(x))g_m(t).\\ &\sum_m\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}}\chi_{(0,a]}(\lambda)\zeta_0^{(m)}e^{-\lambda r}\overline{\Big\{w(\chi_{A^\square}s_m)\Big\}}d\mu(\lambda)dr\\ &\leq\sum_m\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}}|g_m(r)|^2|\zeta_0^{(m)}|^2d\mu(\lambda)dr\Big\}^{1/2}\cdot\\ &\cdot\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^+}e^{-2ar}\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}}\chi_{(0,a]}e^{-2(\lambda-a)}|V(\chi_Af_m)|^2d\mu(\lambda)dr\Big\}^{1/2}\\ &\leq\sum_m C\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{N}}\chi_{(0,a]}|V(\chi_Af_m)|^2d\mu(\lambda)dr\Big\}^{1/2}\\ &=C\sum_m\|\chi_A\mathcal{H}_B((0,a])\chi_Af_m\|_{L^2(\partial L_x)}\\ &\leq C\sum_m\langle\chi_A\mathcal{H}_B((0,a])\chi_Af_m,f_m\rangle\\ &=C\mathrm{tr}(\chi_A\mathcal{H}_B((0,a])\chi_A)<\infty.\end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used the fact that for a projection on a closed subspace K one can compute its trace as, $\mathrm{tr}(K)=\sum_m\langle Kf_m,f_m\rangle=\sum_m\|Kf_m\|$ together with the fact that $\mathcal{H}_B((0,a])$ is a spectral projection of B hence uniformly smoothing. Let us now pass to examine the operator

$$\Pi_a:=\Pi_{\geq a}\circ(\cdot)_{|\partial L_x\times\mathbb{R}^+}\circ\chi_{\{0\}}(D_x^+)$$

defined by

$$L^2(L_x) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_x^+) \longrightarrow L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+) \longrightarrow L^2(\mathbb{R}^+; \mathcal{H}_B(\mathbb{R} \setminus [-a,a])). \tag{31}$$

arising from the second addendum of the splitting (25). Let φ_k be the characteristic function of $r \leq k$ and

$$\Lambda_k := \Pi_{\geq a} \circ \varphi_k \circ (\cdot)_{|\partial_x \times \mathbb{R}^+} \circ \chi_{\{0\}}(D_x^+).$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\Pi_a - \Lambda_k)\xi\| &= \|\Pi_{\geq a}(\varphi_k - 1)(\cdot)_{|\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+} \chi_{\{0\}}(D_x^+)\xi\|_{L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+)} \qquad (32) \\ &= \int_k^\infty \int_{(a,\infty)\times\mathbb{N}} e^{-2\lambda r}|\zeta_0|^2 d\mu(\lambda)dt \leq e^{-2ak} \int_{(a,\infty)\times\mathbb{N}} \int_0^\infty e^{-2\lambda r}|\zeta_0|^2 d\mu(\lambda)dr \\ &\leq e^{-2ak}\|\xi\|_{L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+)}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally choose a compact $A \subset \partial L_x$, estimate (32) shows that $S_k := \chi_{A^\square}\Lambda_k\chi_{A^\square}$ converges uniformly to $\chi_{A^\square}\Pi_a\chi_{A^\square}$. Observe that S_k is compact by Rellich theorem and regularity theory in fact $\Pi_{\mathrm{Ker}(T^+)}$ is obtained by functional calculus from a rapid Borel function hence has a uniformly smoothing Schwartz–kernel (see the appendix for more informations). Since $\chi_{A^\times}\Lambda_k\Pi_{>a}\Pi_{\mathrm{Ker}(T^+)}\chi_{A^\times}$ is norm–limit of compact operators is compact but a compact projection is finite rank. $\square$

5.2 Breuer–Fredholm perturbation

Our main application of the splitting principle is the construction of a Λ–Breuer Fredholm perturbation of the leafwise Dirac operator. We recall some some notations;

$$X_k := X_0 \bigcup_{\partial X_0} \Big(X_0 \times [0,k]\Big), \; Z_k = \partial X_0 \times [k, \infty).$$

Let θ be a smooth function satisfying $\theta = \theta(r) = r$ on Z_1 while $\theta(r) = 0$ on $X_{1/2}$, put $\dot\theta = d\theta/dr$. Let $\Pi_\epsilon := \chi_{I_\epsilon}(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})$ for $I_\epsilon := (-\epsilon, 0) \cup (0, \epsilon)$. Our perturbation will be the leafwise operator

$$D_{\epsilon,u} := D + \dot\theta\Omega(u - D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}\Pi_\epsilon) \text{ for } \epsilon > 0, \quad u \in \mathbb{R} \tag{33}$$

that is $\mathbb{Z}_2$ odd as D. We write $D_{\epsilon,u} = D_{\epsilon,u}^+ \oplus D_{\epsilon,u}^-$ and $D_{\epsilon,u,x}$ for its restriction to L_x, also for brevity $D_{\epsilon,0} := D_\epsilon$.
Notice that the perturbed boundary operator is

$$D_{\epsilon,u}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} = D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}(1 - \Pi_\epsilon) + u = D_{\epsilon,0}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + u. \tag{34}$$

Since for $\epsilon > 0$, 0 is an isolated point in the spectrum of $D_{\epsilon,0}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ we see[14] that $D_{\epsilon,u}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ is invertible for $0 < |u| < \epsilon$. For further application let us compute the essential spectrum of $B_{\epsilon,u}^2$ where

$$B_{\epsilon,u} = D + \Omega(u - D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}\Pi_\epsilon)$$

---

[14] this is a simple application of the functional calculus; if the spectrum of the boundary operator $D_{\epsilon,0}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$ has an hole of around the zero then for $0 < |u| < \epsilon$ also the operator $D_{\epsilon,u}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} = D_{\epsilon,0}^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + u$ has an hole around the zero and is inverted by spectral its function under $f(\lambda) := \chi_{(-\delta,\delta)}(\lambda)\lambda^{-1}$ with some positive δ

on the foliated cylinder Z_0 with product foliation $\mathcal{F}_\partial \times \mathbb{R}$. Since we deal with product structure operators we can surely think the Von Neumann algebra becomes $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda_0}(E) \otimes B(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$ where $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda_0}(E)$ is the Von Neumann algebra of the base i.e. the foliation induced on the transversal $X_0 \times \{0\}$. The integration process shows that the trace is nothing but $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda = \mathrm{tr}_{\Lambda_0} \otimes \mathrm{tr}$ where the second factor is the canonical trace on $B(L^2(\mathbb{R}))$. In section 10.7.1 we will say more on the relation betwenn the boundary algebra and the whole algebra. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} B^2_{\epsilon,u} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_r + u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}(1-\Pi_\epsilon) \\ \partial_r + u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}(1-\Pi_\epsilon) & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 \qquad (35) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} -\partial_r^2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\partial_r^2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}(1-\Pi_\epsilon) \\ u + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}(1-\Pi_\epsilon) & 0 \end{pmatrix}^2 = -\partial_r^2 \,\mathrm{Id} + V^2. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the spectral measure μ_{Λ_0, V^2} of V^2 on the tranversal section $X_0 \times \{0\}$. We claim the following facts

1. $\omega := \inf \mathrm{supp}(\mu_{\Lambda_0, V^2}) > 0$
2. $\mu_{\Lambda, B^2_{\epsilon,u}}(a,b) = \infty, \quad 0 \leq a < b, \quad \omega < b$
3. $\mu_{\Lambda, B^2_{\epsilon,u}}(a,b) = 0, \quad 0 \leq a < b \leq \omega.$

First of all 1. is obvious since (34) together with (35) imply

$$\mathrm{spec}(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u})^2 \subset [(\epsilon + u)^2, \infty).$$

To prove 2. one first observes that we can use the Fourier transform in the cylindrical direction. This gives a spectral representation of $-\partial_r^2$ as the multiplication by y^2 on $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. Choose some $\gamma < (b-\omega)/2$. We can prove the following inclusion for the spectral projections

$$\chi_{(a,\gamma+\omega)}(V^2) \otimes \chi_{(0,\gamma)}(-\partial_r^2) \subset \chi_{(a,b)}(B^2_{\epsilon,u}). \qquad (36)$$

In fact one can also use a (leafwise) spectral representation for V as the multiplication operator by x. Then (36) is reduced to prove the implication

$$a < x^2 < \gamma + \omega, \quad 0 < y^2 < \gamma \Rightarrow a < x^2 + y^2 < b.$$

From (36) follows

$$\mu_{\Lambda, B^2_{\epsilon,u}}(a,b) \geq \mu_{\Lambda_0, V^2}(a, \gamma+\omega) \cdot \mathrm{tr}_{B(L^2(\mathbb{R}))}\, \chi_{(0,\gamma)}(-\partial_r^2) = \infty$$

in fact the first factor is non zero and the second is clearly infinite. Finally the third statement is very similar in the proof. We have shown that

$$\mathrm{spec}_{\Lambda,e}(B^2_{\epsilon,u}) = [\omega, \infty).$$

Proposition 5.40 — The operator $D_{\epsilon,u}$ is Λ–Breuer–Fredholm if $0 < |u| < \epsilon$.

Proof— The splitting principle (actually for order 2 operators but it makes no difference) says that the essential spectrum is determined by the operator on the cylinder for $r > 1$. The above calculation ends the proof. □

In what follows we shall investigate the relations between the Breuer–Fredholm index of the perturbed operator and the L^2–index of the unperturbed Dirac operator. To this end we remark the use of weighted L^2–spaces is fruitful as Melrose shows in [62].

DEFINITION 5.41 — For $u \in \mathbb{R}$, denote $e^{u\theta}L^2$ the Borel field of Hilbert spaces (with obvious Borel structure given by $e^{u\theta} \cdot L^2$ – Borel structure. $\{e^{u\theta}L^2(L_x;E)\}_x$ where, for $x \in X$, $e^{u\theta}L^2(L_x;E)$ is the space of distributional sections w such that $e^{-u\theta}\omega \in L^2(L_x;E)$. Analog definition for weighted Sobolev spaces $e^{u\theta}H^k$ can be written.

Notice that $e^{u\theta}L^2(L_x;E) = L^2(L_x;E,e^{-2u\theta}dg_{|L_x})$ where dg is the leafwise Riemannian density so these Hilbert fields correspond to the representation of $\mathcal{R}$ with the longitudinal measure $x \in X \longmapsto e^{-2u\theta}dg_{|L_x} = r^*(e^{-2u\theta}dg)$ (transverse function, in the language of the non commutative integration theory [26]).
The operators D and its perturbation $D_{\epsilon,u}$ extend to a field of unbounded operators $e^{u\theta}L^2 \longrightarrow e^{u\theta}L^2$ with domain $e^{u\theta}H^1$. Put

$$e^{\infty\theta}L^2_x := \cup_{\delta>0}e^{\delta\theta}L^2_x.$$

In what follows we will use, for brevity the following notation: $\partial L_x := L_x \cap (\partial X_0 \times \{0\})$ and

$$Z_x := \partial L_x \times [0,\infty)$$

for the cylindrical end of the leaf L_x.

For a smooth section $s^\pm$ such that $D^\pm_{\epsilon,u,x}s^\pm = 0$ we have $(D^\pm_{\epsilon,u,x})_{|\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+}(s^\pm)_{|\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+} = 0$ that can be easily seen choosing smooth r–functions ϕ,ψ with $\phi_{X_0} = 1$, $\psi_{Z_{1/4}} = 1$, $\mathrm{supp}(\psi \subset Z_{1/8})$ and evaluating $[D^\pm_{\epsilon,u,x}(\phi(1-\psi)s + \phi\psi s) = 0]_{|\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+}$.
The isomorphism W defined in (23) used in the proof of finiteness property for the kernel projection, can be defined also as an isomorphism $e^{u\theta}L^2(\partial L_x \times \mathbb{R}^+, F) \simeq \mathcal{H}_B \otimes e^{u\theta}L^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$ in a way that solutions of $D^\pm_{\epsilon,u,x}s^\pm = 0$ with conditions $s^\pm \in e^{\infty\theta} \cap L^2_x$ can be represented as solutions of $[\pm\partial_r + \lambda + \dot{\theta}(r)(u - \chi_\epsilon(\lambda)\lambda)]Ws^\pm = 0$ with $\chi_\epsilon(\lambda) = \chi_{(-\epsilon,0)\cup(\epsilon,0)}(\lambda)$ acting as a multiplier on $\bigoplus_j L^2(\mathbb{R},\mu_j)$. In particular (forgetting for brevity the restriction symbol)

$$Ws^\pm = \zeta^\pm_j(\lambda)\exp\{\mp u\theta(r) \mp \lambda[r - \theta(r)\chi_\epsilon(\lambda)]\} \tag{37}$$

with suitable choosen $\zeta^\pm_j(\lambda) \in L^2(\mu_j)$.

PROPOSITION 5.42 — Let $\epsilon > \delta > 0$ and $\delta' \in \mathbb{R}$ then

1. $\xi \in \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta'\theta}L^2}(D^+_x) \Longmapsto \xi_{Z_x} = e^{-rD^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x}h$ with $h \in \chi(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x)_{(-\delta',\infty)}L^2_x$.
2. $\xi \in \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+_{\epsilon,x}) \Longmapsto \xi_{Z_x} = e^{-rD^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x + \theta(r)D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x\Pi_{\epsilon,x}}h$, with $h \in \chi(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x)_{(\epsilon,\infty)}L^2_x$
3. $\xi \in \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+_{\epsilon,x}) \Longmapsto \xi_{|Z_x} = e^{-rD^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x + \theta(r)D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x\Pi_{\epsilon,x}}h$, $h \in \chi(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x)_{(-\epsilon,\infty)}L^2_x$,

recall that $\Pi_{\epsilon,x} = \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)-\{0\}}(D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}_x)$. Moreover the following identity (as fields of operators) holds true

$$D^\pm e^{\mp\theta(r)D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}\Pi_\epsilon} = e^{\mp\theta(r)D^{\mathcal{F}\partial}\Pi_\epsilon}D^\pm_\epsilon.$$

PROOF —

1. From the representation formula (37) of formal solutions for $u = 0$, $\epsilon = 0$ it remains $\xi = \xi_j(\lambda)e^{-\lambda r}$. Then $e^{-\delta'\theta}\xi$ must be square integrable hence clearly $\xi_j(\lambda) = h_j(\lambda) \in \chi_{(-\delta',\infty)}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})$.

The remaining are proved in a very similar way. The last statement is merely a computation. □

Solutions of $D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}s^\pm = 0$ belonging to the space $\bigcap_{u>0} e^{u\theta}L^2(L_x; E^\pm)$ are called L^2*–extended solutions*, in symbols $\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x})$. Next we study this space of solutions as x varies.

Proposition 5.43 — For every $x \in X$ and $0 < u < \epsilon$

$$1.\ \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) = \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{-u\theta}L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) = \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,\mp u,x}) \tag{38}$$

$$2.\ \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) = \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{u\theta}L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) = \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,\pm u,x}). \tag{39}$$

$$3.\ \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) \subset \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x}) \tag{40}$$

Proof— We show only the first equality of (38) the others being very similar. This is a simple application of equation (37). In fact, for $u = 0$, $Ws^\pm = \zeta_j^\pm(\lambda)\exp\{\mp\lambda[r - \theta(r)\chi_\epsilon(\lambda)]\}$. The condition of being square integrable in $(\mathbb{R}, \mu_j) \otimes (\mathbb{R}^+, dr)$ is easily seen to be equivalent to $\zeta_j^+(\lambda) = 0$ $\lambda < \epsilon$, λ–a.e and $\zeta_j^-(\lambda) = 0$ $\lambda > -\epsilon$ in particular, for $r \geq 1$ $Ws^\pm = \zeta_j^\pm(\lambda)e^{\mp\lambda r}\chi_{\pm\lambda\geq\epsilon}(\lambda)$ then $e^{u\theta}s^\pm \in L^2$ if $u < \epsilon$. For the reverse inclusion the proof is the same. For the third stament note that $e^{u\theta}L^2 \subset e^{v\theta}L^2$ for every $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ with $u \leq v$ then $\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2} \subset \mathrm{Ext}$. □

Proposition 5.43 shows that the mapping $x \longmapsto \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,x})$ gives a Borel field of closed subspaces of L^2. No difference in notation between the space Ext and Ker and the corresponding projection in the Von Neumann algebra will be done in the future. Inclusion (40) together with 5.40 and the finiteness property of the L^2–kernel projection says that the difference

$$h^\pm_{\Lambda,\epsilon} = \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_\epsilon)) - \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_\epsilon)) = \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_\epsilon)) - \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_\epsilon)) \in \mathbb{R} \tag{41}$$

is a finite number.

Lemma 5.44 — For $\epsilon > 0$

1. $\dim_\Lambda Ker_{L^2}(D^\pm_\epsilon) = \lim_{u\downarrow 0}\dim_\Lambda Ker_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,\mp u}) = \lim_{u\downarrow 0}\dim_\Lambda Ker_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,\pm u}) - h^\pm_{\Lambda,\epsilon}$,
2. $\mathrm{Ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+_\epsilon) = \lim_{u\downarrow 0}\mathrm{Ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) - h^+_{\Lambda,\epsilon} = \lim_{u\downarrow 0}\mathrm{Ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,-u}) + h^-_{\Lambda,\epsilon}$

Proof— Nothing to prove here, proposition 5.43 says that the limit is constant for u sufficiently small, the second one in the statement follows from the first by summation. □

Now define the extended solutions $\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_x)$ in the same way i.e. distributional solution of the differential operator $D^\pm_x : C^\infty_c(L_x; E^\pm) \longrightarrow C^\infty_c(E^\mp; E)$ belonging to each weighted L^2–space with positive weights,

$$\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_x) = \bigcap_{u>0}\mathrm{Ker}_{e^{u\theta}L^2}(D^\pm) = \{s \in C^{-\infty}(L_x; E^\pm);\ D^\pm s = 0;\ e^{-u\theta}s \in L^2\ \forall u > 0\}.$$

Here we have made use of the longitudinal Riemannian density to to identify sections with sections with values on density and the Hermitian metric on E, in a way that one has the isomorphism $C^{-\infty}(L_x; E^{\pm}) \simeq C_c^{\infty}(L_x; (E^{\pm})^* \otimes \Omega(L_x))$ to simplify the notation with distributional sections of the bundle E.
It is clear by standard elliptic regularity that extended solutions of $D^{\pm}$ are smooth on each leaf. In fact $D^{\pm}$ a first order differential elliptic operator and one can construct a parametrix i.e. an inverse of $D^{\pm}$ modulo a smoothing operator i.e. an operator sending each Sobolev space onto each Sobolev space (of the new, weighted metric).

REMARK — By definition $\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm}) \subset e^{u\theta}L^2$ for every $u > 0$, define $\dim_{\Lambda}^{(\mathrm{u})}(\mathrm{Ext})$ as the trace in $\mathrm{End}_{\Lambda}(e^{u\theta}L^2)$ of the projection on the closure of Ext, now we must check that under the natural inclusion $e^{u\theta}L^2 \subset e^{u'\theta}L^2$ if $u < u'$, these dimensions are preserved. This is done at once in fact the inclusion $\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm}) \subset e^{u\theta}L^2 \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm}) \subset e^{u'\theta}L^2$ is bounded and extends to a bounded mapping

$$\overline{\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm})}^{e^{u\theta}L^2} \longrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm})}^{e^{u'\theta}L^2}$$

with dense range. Now the unitary part of its polar decomposition is an unitary isomorphism then the Λ dimensions are the same by 1. in 4.7.

DEFINITION 5.45 — The Λ–dimension of the space of extended solution is

$$\dim_{\Lambda} \mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm}) := \dim_{\Lambda} \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm})}^{e^{u\theta}L^2}$$

for some $u > 0$.

PROPOSITION 5.46 —

1. $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \dim_{\Lambda} \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_{\epsilon}^{\pm}) = \dim_{\Lambda} \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{\pm})$
2. $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \mathrm{Ind}_{L^2,\Lambda} D_{\epsilon}^{+} = \mathrm{Ind}_{L^2,\Lambda} D^{+}$
3. $\lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \dim_{\Lambda} \mathrm{Ext}(D_{\epsilon}^{\pm}) = \dim_{\Lambda} \mathrm{Ext}(D^{\pm})$

PROOF —

1. Let $\xi \in \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_{\epsilon,x}^{+})$ thanks to Proposition 5.42

   $$\xi_{Z_x} = e^{-rD_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} + \theta(r) D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi - \epsilon, x} h, \ h \in \chi_{(\epsilon,\infty)}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial})$$

   from $\Pi_{\epsilon,x} h = 0$ we get

   $$\begin{aligned} D_x^{+} \xi_{|Z_x} &= (D_{\epsilon,x}^{+} + \theta(r) D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi_{\epsilon,x}) \xi_{|Z_x} = \theta(r) D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi_{\epsilon,x}(\xi_{|Z_x}) \\ &= \theta(r) D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi_{\epsilon,x}(e^{-rD_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} + \theta(r) D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi_{\epsilon,x}} h) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

   meaning that $\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D_{\epsilon,x}^{+}) \subset \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{+})$. Moreover

   $$\begin{aligned} &D_{\epsilon}^{+}(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{+})) \\ &\quad = \dot{\theta} D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} \Pi_{\epsilon,x}(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{+}) \subset -\dot{\theta} D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial} e^{-rD_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial}} \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}\partial})(L^2(\partial L_x \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^{+})). \end{aligned}$$

Note that clearly $\dim_\Lambda \left[\dot\theta D_x^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} e^{-rD_x^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}} \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})(L^2(\partial L_x \otimes L^2(\mathbb{R}^+))\right] \longrightarrow_{\epsilon\to 0} 0$ by the normality of the trace. Then the family of operators

$$D^+_{\epsilon\,|\,\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)} : \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+) \longrightarrow L^2$$

has kernel $\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+_{\epsilon,x})$ and range with Λ dimension going to zero, 1. follows by looking at an hortogonal decomposition $\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+) = \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+_\epsilon) \oplus \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)/\,\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+_\epsilon)$.

2. Follows immediately from 1.

3. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+) \arrow[r] \arrow[dr, "\Psi^+_\epsilon"] & \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{(\delta+\epsilon)\theta}L^2}(D^+) \\
 & \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+_\epsilon) \arrow[u, "\Psi^-_\epsilon"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\Psi^\pm_\epsilon = e^{\pm\theta\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}}$. It is easily seen thanks to the representation of solutions in proposition 5.42 that each arrow is injective and bounded with respect to the inclusions

$$\begin{tikzcd}
e^{\delta\theta}L^2 \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & e^{(\delta+2\epsilon)\theta}L^2\ . \\
 & e^{(\delta+\epsilon)\theta}L^2 \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

Then joining together the two diagrams,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+) \arrow[r] \arrow[dr, "\Psi^+_\epsilon"] & \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{(\delta+\epsilon)\theta}L^2}(D^+) \arrow[r] & e^{(\delta+2\epsilon)\theta}L^2 \arrow[d] \\
 & \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+_\epsilon) \arrow[u, "\Psi^-_\epsilon"] \arrow[r] & e^{(\delta+\epsilon)\theta}L^2
\end{tikzcd}$$

and using the last column to measure dimensions one gets the inequality

$$\dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+) \leq \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^+_\epsilon) \leq \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{(\delta+\epsilon)\theta}L^2}(D^+)$$

from which 3. immediately follows.

□

6 Cylindrical finite propagation speed and Cheeger Gromov Taylor type estimates.

6.1 The standard case

A very important property of the Dirac operator on a manifold of bounded geometry X is finite propagation speed for the associated wave equation. Let $P \in \mathrm{UDiff}^1(X,E)$ uniformly elliptic first order (formally) self–adjoint operator.

Definition 6.47 — The diffusion speed of P in x is the norm of the principal symbol

$$\sup_{v\in S^*_x} |\sigma_{\mathrm{pr}}(P)(x)|$$

(S^*_x) is the fibre of cosphere bundle at x). Taking the supremum on x in M one gets the maximal diffusion speed $c = c(P)$.
We say that an operator has finite propagation speed if its maximal diffusion speed is finite.

REMARK — A (generalized) Dirac operator associated to bounded geometry datas (manifold and clifford structure) has finite propagation speed in fact its principal symbol is Clifford multiplication.

The starting point is an application of the spectral theorem to show that for every initial data $\xi_0 \in C^\infty_c(X, E)$ there is a unique solution $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ of the Cauchy problem for the wave equation associated with P,

$$\begin{cases} \partial\xi/\partial t - iP\xi = 0, \\ \xi(0) = \xi_0, \end{cases} \tag{42}$$

this solution is given by the application of the one parameter group of unitaries $\xi(t) = e^{itP}\xi_0$. By the Stone theorem the domain of P is invariant under each unitary e^{itP} and $e^{itP}$is bounded from each Sobolev space H^s into itself. In particular the domain of P is invariant under each unitary e^{itP}.

LEMMA 6.48 — For θ suitably small and $x \in M$, $\|\xi(t)\|_{L^2 B(x,\theta - ct)}$ is decreasing in t. In particular $\operatorname{supp}(\xi_0) \subset B(x, r) \Longrightarrow \operatorname{supp}(e^{itP}\xi_0) \subset B(x, r + ct)$.

PROOF— The proof is in J. Roe's book [79] Prop. 5.5 and lemma 5.1. Next we shall prove something similar in the cylindrical end. First one proves that for a small geodesic ball of radius r the function $\|e^{itP}\xi_0\|_{L^2(B(x,r-ct))}$ is decreasing. This is called energy estimate; then the second step follows easily. □

Finite propagation speed techniques provide us with the construction of a functional calculus; a morphism of algebras $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow B(L^2(X, E))$, $f \longmapsto f(P)$ with properties

- Continuity, $\|f(P)\| \le \sup|f|$ hence it can be extended to $C_0(\mathbb{R})$, the space of continuous functions vanishing at infinity.
- If $f(x) = xg(x)$ then $f(P) = Pg(P)$.
- We have the representation formula in terms of the inverse Fourier transform

  $$f(P) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(t)e^{itP}dt/2\pi, \tag{43}$$

  here $\hat{\cdot}$ is Fourier transform and the integral converges in the weak operator topology, namely $\langle f(P)x, y\rangle = \int \hat{f}(t)\langle e^{itP}x, y\rangle dt/2\pi$, for every $x, y \in L^2(X; E)$. If $X = S^1$ this is just Poisson summation formula.

The representation (43) gives indeed further informations, as an example we recount how John Roe, using ideas contained in [23] used to build a pseudodifferential calculus.
Let $S^m(\mathbb{R})$ be the space of symbols of order $\le m$ on the real line i.e. smooth functions such that $|f^\lambda(k)| \le C_k(1 + |\lambda|)^{m-k}$. This is a Fréchet space with best constants C_k as seminorms and $\mathcal{S}(R) = \bigcap S^m(\mathbb{R})$.
Roe proves in [80] that for a bounded geometry Dirac operator D every spectral function $f(D)$ with f a symbol of order $\le m$ is a uniform pseudodifferential operator of order m. The proof of this fact uses formula (43) together with a convolution smoothing technique.

Now formula (43) leads us to an easy method to obtain pointwise extimates of the Schwartz kernel $[f(P)]$ for a class Schwartz function f. In fact due to the ellipticity of P, $f(P)$ is a uniformly smoothing operator and $[f(P)] \in UC^\infty(X \times X; \mathrm{End}(E))$ (see the appendix A) here we have used the Riemannian density to remove the density coefficient in the Schwartz kernels.

Proposition 6.49 — Take some section $\xi \in L^2(X; E)$ supported into a geodesic ball $B(x, r)$ then the following estimate holds true

$$\|f(P)\xi\|_{L^2(X-B(x,R))} \leq (2\pi)^{-1/2}\|\xi\|_{L^2(X)} \int_{\mathbb{R}-I_R} |\hat{f}(s)|ds, \tag{44}$$

where $I_R := (-\frac{r-R}{c}, \frac{r-R}{c})$ with the convention that $I_R = \emptyset$ if $R \leq r$.

Proof— From the finite propagation speed

$$\mathrm{supp}(e^{itP}\xi) \subset B(x, r + c|t|). \tag{45}$$

From the identity (43),

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(P)\xi\|_{L^2(X-B(x,R))} &= \left\| (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(s) e^{isP} \xi ds \right\|_{L^2(X-B(x,R))} \\ &\leq \left\| (2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}-I_R} \hat{f}(s) e^{isP} \xi ds \right\|_{L^2(X)} \\ &\leq (2\pi)^{-1/2} \|\xi\|_{L^2(X)} \int_{\mathbb{R}-I_R} |\hat{f}(s)| ds \end{aligned}$$

where $I_R := (-\frac{r-R}{c}, \frac{r-R}{c})$ with the convention that $I_R = \emptyset$ if $R \leq r$. In fact

$$\|f(P)\xi\|^2_{L^2(X-B(x,R))} = (2\pi)^{-1} \int_R |\hat{f}(s)|^2 \|e^{isP}\xi\|^2_{L^2(X-B(x,R))} ds$$

and the function $s \longmapsto \|e^{isP}\xi\|^2_{L^2(X-B(x,R))}$ is zero if $|s| < \frac{r-R}{c}$ from (45). $\square$

So the point of view is the following;

1. Mapping properties of $f(D)$ will lead to pointwise estimates on the Schwartz kernel of $f(D)$ [23]. More precisely; start with a compactly supported section s, suppose we can extimate the L^2 norm of the image $f(D)s$ on a small ball B at some distance d from the support, then by elliptic regularity (Gärding inequality) and Sobolev embeddings we can extimate the kernel $[f(D)]$ pointwisely.
2. This L^2 norm, $\|f(D)s\|_{L^2(B)}$ is extimated in terms the L^1 norm of the Fourier transform $\|\hat{f}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R})}$. As d increases we can cut large and large intervals around zero in $\mathbb{R}$. This means that the relevant norm becomes $\|\hat{f}\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}-I_d)}$ where I_d is an interval containing zero. The limit case of this phenomenon says that spectral functions made by functions with compactly supported Fourier transforms will produce properly supported operators i.e. operators whose kernel lies within a δ–neighborhood of the diagonal. For a good application of finite propagation speed in Foliations one can look at the paper [82] where is showen that spectral functions $f(D)$ where f has compactly supported Fourier transform have some special properties (they belong to the C^*–algebra of the foliation).

Estimate (44) is the starting point. The following proposition shows how to work out pointwise estimates on the kernel from this mapping properties. This is a very rough version of the ideas contained in [23]

PROPOSITION 6.50 — Let $r_1 > 0$ sufficiently small, $x, y \in X$ put

$$R(x,y) := \max\{0, d(x,y) - r_1\}$$

and $\bar{n} := [n/2+1]$, $n = \dim X$, $I(x,y) := (-R(x,y)/c, R(x,y)/c)$. For a Schwartz class function $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

$$\left|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k [f(P)]_{(x,y)}\right| \leq \mathcal{C}(P,l,k,r_1) \sum_{j=0}^{2\bar{n}+l+k} \int_{\mathbb{R}-I(x,y)} \left|\hat{f}^{(j)}(s)\right| ds. \tag{46}$$

PROOF— $|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k [f(P)]_{(x_0,y_0)}| \leq C_0 \|\nabla_x^l [f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{H^{\bar{n}+k}(B(y_0,r_1/3))}$ where C_0 is the constant[15] of the Sobolev embedding $H^{\bar{n}+k}(B(y_0,r_1/3)) \longrightarrow UC^k(B(y_0,r_1/3))$ applied to the function $\nabla_x^l [f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)}$.
Then we have to apply the Gårding inequality of P

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla_x^l [f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{H^{\bar{n}+k}(B(y_0,r_1/3))} &\leq C_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k} \|\nabla_x^l P_y [f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{L^2(B(y_0,r_1/2))} \\
&= C_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k} \|\nabla_x^l [f(P)P]_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_1/2))}
\end{aligned}$$

in fact by self adjointness $P_y[f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)} = [f(P)P]_{(x_0,\bullet)}$. No problem here in *localizing* the Gårding inequality we can choose in fact for each y_0 a function χ supported in $B(y_0, r_1)$ with $\chi_{|B(y_0,r_1/2)} = 1$. Then since the coefficients of P in normal coordinates are uniformly bounded, each $[P,\chi]$ is uniformly bounded. Let $\xi_j(y) := \chi_{B(y_0,r_1/2)}(y) \nabla_x^l [P^j f(P)]_{(x_0,y)}$ the inequality becomes $|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k [f(P)]_{(x_0,y_0)}| \leq C_0 C_1 \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k} \|\xi_j\|_{L^2(X)}$.
Now

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\xi_j\|_{L^2(X)}^2 &= \int \chi_{B(y_0,r_1/2)} \nabla [P^j f(P)]_{(x_0,\bullet)} \xi_j(y) dy = |(\nabla_x^l P^j f(P) \xi_j)(x_0)| \\
&\leq C_2 \|P^j f(P) \xi_j\|_{H^{\bar{n}+l}(B(x_0,r_1/3))} \leq C_2 C_3 \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l} \|P^{j+i} f(P) \xi_j\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_1/2))}
\end{aligned}$$

again by Sobolev embedding and Gårding inequality. The choice to keep every constant is motivated to control their dependence in order to apply these extimates leaf by leaf.
Finally putting everything together

$$\begin{aligned}
|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k [f(P)]_{(x_0,y_0)}| &\leq \mathcal{C} \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k} \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l} \|P^{j+i} f(P)\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_1/2)),L^2(B(y_0,r_{1/2}))} \\
&\underbrace{\leq \mathcal{C}}_{(44)} \sum_{j=0}^{2\bar{n}+l+k} \int_{\mathbb{R}-I(x_0,y_0)} |\hat{f}^{(j)}(s)| ds
\end{aligned}$$

---

[15] if preferable one can suppose $B(y_0, r_1)$ a geodesic ball and multiply by a cut off φ supported within distance $r_1/3$ from y_0 and use the global Sobolev embedding. In that case the constant depends on φ but using normal coordinates φ can be used well for each y_0

$\square$

For the heat kernel $[f(P)] = [e^{-tP^2}]$ when $f(x) = e^{-tx^2}$, $\hat{f}(s) = (2t)^{-1/2}e^{-s^2/4t}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{f}(s)^{(k)} &= \frac{1}{(2t)^{1/2}(4t)^{k/2}}((4t)^{1/2}\partial_s)^k e^{-\left(\frac{s}{(4t)^{1/2}}\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{C(k)}{t^{(k+1)/2}} H_k\Big(\frac{s}{(4t)^{1/2}}\Big)e^{-\left(\frac{s}{(4t)^{1/2}}\right)^2},\end{aligned}$$

where H_k is the k–th Hermite polynomial. Then using the simple inequalities

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_u^\infty e^{-x}dx \leq e^{-u^2},\ y^s e^{ay^2} \leq \Big(\frac{s}{2ae}\Big)^{s/2},\ a, s, u, y \in \mathbb{R}^+, \\ &\int_u^\infty y^s e^{-y^2}dy = \int_u^\infty y^s e^{-\epsilon y^2}e^{-(1-\epsilon)y^2}dy \leq C(s,\epsilon)e^{-(1-\epsilon)u^2}\end{aligned}$$

with $R = R(x, y)$ and $\eta = 2\bar{n} + l + k$

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_x^l\nabla_y^k[P^m e^{-tP^2}]_{(x,y)}| &\leq \mathcal{C}\sum_{j=m}^{\eta+n} t^{-j/2}\int_{R/c}^\infty \Big|H_j\Big(\frac{s}{(4t)^{1/2}}\Big)\Big|e^{-\left(\frac{s}{(4t)^{1/2}}\right)^2}(4t)^{-1/2}ds \qquad (47)\\ &\leq \mathcal{C}\sum_{j=m}^{\eta+m} t^{-j/2}\int_{R/2c\sqrt{t}}^\infty |H_j(x)|e^{-x^2}dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}\sum_{j=m}^{\eta+m} t^{-j/2}\int_{R/2c\sqrt{t}}^\infty (1+x^j)e^{-x^2}dx \\ &\leq \mathcal{C}e^{-R^2/5c^2t}\sum_{j=m}^{\lambda+m} t^{-j/2} \\ &\leq \begin{cases} \mathcal{C}(k,l,m,P)t^{-m/2}e^{-R^2/6c^2t},\ \ t > T \\ \mathcal{C}(k,l,m,P)e^{R^2/6c^2t},\ \ d(x,y) > 2r_1 \end{cases} t \in \mathbb{R}^+.\end{aligned}$$

There's also a relative version of Proposition 6.50 in which two differential, formally self–adjoint uniformly elliptic operators P_1 and P_2 are considered. More precisely relative means that P_1 acts on $E_1 \longrightarrow X_1$ and P_2 acts on $E_2 \longrightarrow X_2$ with open sets $U_1 \subset X_1$, $U_2 \subset X_2$ and isometries φ, Φ

$$\begin{tikzcd} E_{1|U_1} \arrow[r, "\Phi"] \arrow[d] & E_{2|U_2} \arrow[d] \\ U_1 \arrow[r, "\varphi"] & U_2 \end{tikzcd}$$

making possible to identify P_1 with P_2 upon $U = U_1 = U_2$ i.e.

$$\Phi(P_1 s) = P_2(\Phi s), \quad s \in C_c^\infty(U_1; E_1)$$

where Φ is again used to denote the mapping induced on sections

$$\Phi : C_c^\infty(U_1; E_1) \longrightarrow C_c^\infty(U_2; E_2),\ (\Phi s)(y) := \Phi_{\varphi^{-1}(y)}s(\varphi^{-1}(y)).$$

Thanks to the identification one calls $P = P_1 = P_2$ over U. Then the relative version of the estimate (46) is contained in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 6.51 — Choose $r_2 > 0$ and let x, y be in U. Set

$$Q(x,y) := \max\{\min\{d(x,\partial U); d(y,\partial U)\} - r_2; 0\}, \ J(x,y) := \Big(\frac{-Q(x,y)}{c}, \frac{Q(x,y)}{c}\Big).$$

For $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k([f(P_1)] - [f(P_2)])_{(x,y)}| \leq \mathcal{C}(P_1, k, l, r_2) \sum_{j=0}^{2\bar{n}+l+k} \int_{\mathbb{R}-J(x,y)} |\hat{f}^{(j)}(s)| ds.$$

More precisely the reason of the dependence of the constant only to P_1 is that it depends upon $P_{1|U}$ where the operators coincide.

PROOF— This is very similar to the proof of 44. Choose $x_0, y_0 \in U$ then

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k([f(P_1)] - [f(P_2)])_{(x_0,y_0)}| &\leq C \|\nabla_x^l([f(P_1)] - [f(P_2)]_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{H^{\bar{n}+k}(B(y_0,r_2/3))} \\ &\leq C \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k} \|\nabla_x^l([P_1^j f(P_1)] - [P_2^j f(P_2)])_{(x_0,\bullet)}\|_{L^2(B(y_0,r_2/2))}. \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

Where the first step is Sobolev embedding $H^{\bar{n}+k} \longrightarrow UC^k$, again no problem in reducing the Sobolev norm to be computed on the ball $B(y_0, r_2/3)$ in fact one can suppose r_2 is smaller than the injectivity radius and build a cut off function χ. The Sobolev embedding is applied then to the section $\chi\nabla_x^k[f(P_1) - f(P_2)]$ and the resulting constant C will be depending also on χ but uniform geometry assumption makes χ universal in that can be used on each normal coordinate. For example for the Sobolev order one the argument one applies is

$$\|\nabla_y \chi t\|_{H^1} \leq \|(\nabla_y \chi)t\|_{L^2} + \|\chi \nabla_y t\|_{L^2} \leq D(\chi, 1)\|t\|_{H^1(B(y_0,r_2/3))}$$

if χ is supported in $B(y_0, r_2/3)$.

The second step is Gårding inequality of P_1 and P_2 together with the fact that they coincide on U_1. The same argument with a cut off function χ_2 also works well with Gårding inequality. Let $\xi_j(y) := \chi_{B(y_0,r_2/2)}(y)\nabla_x^l\{[P_1^j f(P_1)]_{(x_0,y)} - [P_2^j f(P_2)]_{(x_0,y)}\}$ then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\xi_j\|^2_{L^2(B(y_0,r_2/2))} =& |(\nabla_x^l(P_1^j f(P_1) - P_2^j f(P_2))\xi_j)(x_0)| \\ &\leq C\|P_1^j f(P_1) - P_2^j f(P_2)\xi_j\|_{H^{\bar{n}+l}(B(x_0,r_2/3))} \\ &\leq C\sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l} \|P_1^{j+i} f(P_1) - P_2^{j+i} f(P_2)\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_2/2))} \\ &\leq C\|\xi_j\|_{L^2(U)} \sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l} \int_{\mathbb{R}-J(x,y)} |\hat{f}^i(s)| ds \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

in fact for a class Schwartz function g,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(g(P_1) - g(P_2))\xi_j\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_2/2))} =& \Big\|(2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{g}(s)(e^{isP_1} - e^{isP_2})\xi_j ds\Big\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_2/2))} \\ =& \Big\|(2\pi)^{-1/2} \int_{\mathbb{R}-J(x_0,y_0)} \hat{g}(s)(e^{isP_1} - e^{isP_2})\xi_j ds\Big\|_{L^2(B(x_0,r_2/2))} \end{aligned}$$

since $\mathrm{supp}(e^{iP_is}\xi_j) \subset B(y_0, r_2/2 + c|s|)$ then $e^{isP_1\xi_j}$ and $e^{isP_2\xi_j}$ remain supported in U then $e^{isP_1}\xi_j = e^{isP_2}\xi_j$ by the uniqueness of the solution of the Cauchy problem for the wave equation. □

Proposition 6.52 — The relative version of (47) is

$$|\nabla_x^l \nabla_y^k([P_1^m e^{-tP_1^2}] - [P_2^m e^{-tP_2^2}])_{(x,y)}| \leq \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{C}(k,l,m,P_1)t^{-m/2}e^{-Q(x,y)^2/6c^2t},\ t > T \\ \mathcal{C}(k,l,m,P_1)e^{-Q(x,y)^2/6c^2t}, \end{array} \right. .$$

for $x, y \in U$, $d(x, \partial U)$, $d(y, \partial U) > r_2$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$.

6.2 The cylindrical case

In this section our manifold L will be the generic leaf of the foliation i.e. start with a manifold with bounded geometry L_0 with boundary ∂L_0 composed of possibly infinite connected components and a product type Riemannian metric near the boundary. Glue an infinite cylinder $Z_0 = \partial L_0 \times [0, \infty)$ with product metric and denote $L := L_0 \cup_{\partial L_0} Z_0$. Let $E \longrightarrow L$ be an Hermitian Clifford bundle. Every notation of section 2 is keeped on with the slight abuse that Z_0 is the cylinder here and in X. Recall that $E_{|Z_0} = F \oplus F$.

Definition 6.53 — We say that a first order uniformly elliptic (formally) selfadjoint operator $T \in \mathrm{Op}^1(L; E)$ has product structure if

1. T restricts to L_0 and Z_0 i.e. $\mathrm{supp}(Ts) \subset L_0(Z_0)$ if s is supported on L_0 (Z_0).
2. $T_{|L_0}$ is a uniformly elliptic differential operator.
3. T restricts to the cylinder to have the form

$$T_{|Z_0} = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega B(r) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B(r) - \partial_r \\ B(r) + \partial(r) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for a smooth[16] mapping $B : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Op}^1(\partial L_0; E)$ with values on the subspace of uniformly elliptic and selfadjoint operators. Furthermore suppose that $B(r) \cong B$ is constant for $r \geq 2$.

However this is only a model embracing our Breuer–Fredholm perturbation of the Dirac operator in fact

$$(D_{\epsilon,u,x})_{|\partial_x \times \mathbb{R}^+} = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega\, \underbrace{(\dot{\theta}u - \dot{\theta}D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}\Pi_\epsilon + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})}_{B(r)}. \tag{50}$$

In this sense every result from here to the end of the section has to be thought applied to $D_{\epsilon,u}$.

---

[16] Some words about the smoothness condition on the mapping B. Here we shall make use only of pseudodifferential operators with uniformly bounded symbols, (almost everywhere they will be smoothing operators) hence the smoothness condition of the family is the usual one. In particular this is the smoothness of the family of operators acting on the fibers of $\partial L_0 \times \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, $B(t) \in \mathrm{Op}^1(\partial L_0 \times \{t\}; E)$. If U is a coordinate set for ∂L_0 such a family is determined by a smooth mapping $p : \mathbb{R}^+ \longrightarrow \mathrm{S}^1_{\mathrm{hom}}(U)$ in the space of polihomogeneous symbols. Here smooth means that each derivative $t \longmapsto d^k\sigma/dt^k$ is continuous as a mapping with values in the space of symbols (with the symbols topology, see [94])

Again the spectral theorem shows that for a compactly supported section $\xi_0 \in C_c^\infty(L;E)$ there is a unique solution $t \mapsto \xi(t)$ of the Cauchy problem (42) for the wave equation associated with T. This solution is given by the application of the wave one parameter group e^{itT} with the same properties written above in the standard case.

PROPOSITION 6.54 — Cylindrical finite propagation speed. Let $U = \partial L_0 \times (a,b)$ $0 < a < b$ and $B(U,l) = \{x \in L : d(x,U) < l\}$. For $\xi_0 \in C_c^\infty(L;E)$ let $\xi(t) = e^{itT}\xi_0$ the solution of the wave equation. If $\alpha < a$ the function $\|\xi(t)\|_{L^2(B(U,\alpha-t))}$ is not increasing in t. In particular

$$\operatorname{supp}(\xi_0) \subset U \Longmapsto \operatorname{supp}(\xi(t)) \subset B(U,t).$$

PROOF — The product structure of the operator makes us possible to repeat the standard proof of the energy estimates and finite propagation speed that can be found in John Roe's book [79]. So let us consider

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\xi(t)\|^2{}_{L^2(B(U,\alpha-t))} &= \frac{d}{dt}\int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} |\xi(t)|^2(z)dz \\ &\leq \left|\int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} \Big(\langle \xi(t), iT\xi(t)\rangle + \langle iT\xi(t),\xi(t)\rangle\Big)(z)dz\right| - \int_{\partial B(U,\alpha-t)} |\xi(t)|^2(z)dz.\end{aligned}$$

Since the operator T has product structure, the integration domain is a product and the operator $B(t)$ is selfadjoint on the base

$$\int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} \langle \xi(t), iT\xi(t)\rangle + \langle iT\xi(t),\xi(t)\rangle dz = \int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} \langle \xi(t), ic(\partial_r)\partial_r\xi(t)\rangle + \langle ic(\partial_r)\partial_r\xi(t),\xi(t)\rangle dz.$$

Here the fact that the function

$$r \longmapsto \int_{\partial L_0} \Big(\langle i\Omega B(r)\xi(t)_{|\partial L_0\times\{r\}}, \xi(t)_{|\partial L_0\times\{r\}}\rangle + \langle \xi(t)_{|\partial L_0\times\{r\}}, i\Omega B(r)\xi(t)_{|\partial L_0\times\{r\}}\rangle\Big)(x)dx$$

is identically zero by the self–adjointness of B has been used. Note that $\xi(t)_{|\partial L_0\times\{r\}}$ is in the domain of $B(r)$ by the theorem (however it is certainly true for operators in the form of our perturbation (50)). Finally

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\|\xi(t)\|^2_{L^2(B(U,\alpha-t))} &\leq \left|\int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} \Big(\langle \xi(t), ic(\partial_r)\partial_r\xi(t)\rangle + \langle ic(\partial_r)\partial_r\xi(t), ic(\partial_r)\partial_r\xi(t)\rangle(z)\Big)dz\right| \\ - \int_{\partial B(U,\alpha-t)} |\xi(t)|^2(z) &= \left|\int_{B(U,\alpha-t)} \partial_r\langle \xi(t), c(\partial_r)\xi(t)\rangle(z)dz\right| - \int_{\partial B(U,\alpha-t)} |\xi(t)|^2(z) \leq 0\end{aligned}$$

□

As a notation for a subset $H \in L$ and $t \geq 0$ put $H * t := B(H,t) \cup \partial L_0 \times (\alpha - t, \beta + t)$ where $\alpha := \inf\{r(z) : z \in H \cap Z_0\}$ and $\beta := \max\{r(z) : z \in H \cap Z_0\}$ in other words $H * t$ is the set of points at distance t from H in the cylindrical direction.
It is clear from (6.54) that the support of the solution of the wave problem satisfies

$$\operatorname{supp}(e^{itT}\xi) \subset \operatorname{supp}(\xi) * |t|.$$

Then the cylindrical basic Cheeger–Gromov–Taylor estimate similar to (44) is obtained in the following way:

first note that proposition 6.54 is certainly true if the propagation speed is c, for a section ξ supported into a ball $B(x,r_0)$ and $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ let $I_R := (-(R-r_0)/c,(R-r_0)/c)$ if $R > r_0$ and $I_R = \emptyset$ if $r \leq R$ then,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f(P)\xi\|_{L^2(L-B(x,r_0)*R)} =& \Big\|(2\pi)^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}} \hat{f}(s)e^{isP}\xi ds\Big\|_{L^2(L-B(x,r_0)*R)} && (51)\\ \leq& \Big\|(2\pi)^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}-I_R} \hat{f}(s)e^{isP}\xi ds\Big\|_{L^2(L)} \\ \leq& (2\pi)^{-1/2}\|\xi\|_{L^2(L)}\int_{\mathbb{R}-I_R}|\hat{f}|ds, && (52)\end{aligned}$$

since $\operatorname{supp} e^{isP}\xi \cap (L-B*R) = \emptyset$ for $|t| < (R-r_0)/c$.

Proposition 6.55 — Choose two points on the cylinder $z_1 = (x_1,s_1)$ and $z_2 = (x_2,s_2)$ with $s_i > r_1$, $|s_1-s_2| > 2r_1$, put $I(z_1,z_2) := \Big(-\frac{|s_1-s_2|+r_1}{c}, \frac{|s_1-s_2|-r_1}{c}\Big)$ then for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$,

$$|\nabla^l_{z_1}\nabla^k_{z_2}[f(P)]_{(z_1.z_2)}| \leq \mathcal{C}(P,l,k)\sum_{j=0}^{2\bar{n}+l+k}\int_{R-I(z_1,z_2)}|\hat{f}(s)^{(j)}|ds$$

with $\bar{n} := [n/2+1]$

Proof—

Imitate the proof of 6.50 till the estimate

$$|\nabla^l_x\nabla^k_y[f(P)]_{(x,y)}| \leq C\sum_{j=0}^{\bar{n}+k}\|\xi_j\|_{L^2(L)}$$

where $\xi_j := \chi_{B(y,r_1=2)}\nabla^l_x[P^jf(P)]_{(x,\bullet)}$ and $x,y \in L$.
There is a subtle point we need to reckle, it is when one let P^j act on $[f(P)]_{(x,\bullet)}$. This is perfectly granted by the smoothing properties of $f(P)$ in fact, let the bundle be $L\times\mathbb{R}$ and identify distributions with functions through the Riemannian density. The operator $f(P)$ extends to and operator from compactly supported distributions to distributions (actually takes values on smooth functions). Consider the family of Dirac masses $\delta_y(\cdot)$ concentrated at y, first note that

$$[f(P)]_{(x,y)} = (f(P)\delta_y(\cdot))(x) \tag{53}$$

in fact by selfadjointness

$$\langle f(P)\delta_y, s\rangle = \langle\delta_y, f(P)s\rangle = \int[f(P)]_{(z,y)}t(z)dz,$$

that's to say (53). Now the Sobolev embedding theorem says that $\delta_y \in H^k(X)$ with $k < -n/2$ with norms uniformly (in y) bounded. Since $f(P)$ maps every Sobolev space into each other Sobolev space, every section $[f(P)]_{(x,\bullet)}$ (and the symmetric one by selfadjointness) is in the domain of P^j.
Again

$$\begin{aligned}\|\xi_j\|^2_{L^2(L)} &= \|\chi_{B(y,r_1/2)}\nabla^l_x[P^jf(P)]_{(x,\bullet)}\|^2_{L^2(B(y,r_1/2))}\\ &= |\nabla^l_xP^jf(P)\xi_j(x)| \leq C\|P^jf(P)\xi_j\|_{H^{\bar{n}+l}B(x,r_1/3)}\\ &\leq C\sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l}\|P^jf(P)\xi_j\|_{L^2(B(x,r_1/2))}. && (54)\end{aligned}$$

It's time to move on to the cylindrical end, so let $x = (x_2, s_2)$, $y = (x_1, s_1)$ with $s_i > r_1$ and $|s_1 - s_2| > 2r_1$, then last term in (54) can be estimated by

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\bar{n}+l} \|P^{j+i} f(P)\xi_j\|_{L^2(V)}$$

with $V = L - B(y, r_1/2) * c(|s_1 - s_2| - r_1)/2$ so we can conclude by application of (52). □

COROLLARY 6.56 — With the notations of the proposition above

1. If $|s_1 - s_2| > 2r_1$, $s_i > r_1$

$$|\nabla^l_{z_1} \nabla^k_{z_2} [P^m e^{-tP^2}]_{(z_1,z_2)}| \leq \mathcal{C}(k, l, m, P) e^{-\dfrac{(|s_1 - s_2| - r_1)^2}{6t}} \tag{55}$$

2. Let ψ_1, ψ_2 compactly supported with supports at r–distance d on the cylinder, then for the operator norm and $t > 0$

$$\|\psi_1 P^m e^{-tP^2} \psi_2\| \leq \mathcal{C}(m, \psi_1, \psi_2) e^{-d^2/6t}. \tag{56}$$

3. The relative version of (55) is

$$|\nabla^l_{z_1} \nabla^k_{z_2} [P^m e^{-tP^2} - T^m e^{-tT^2}]_{(z_1,z_2)}| \leq \mathcal{C}(k, l, m, P) e^{\{-(\min\{s_1,s_2\} - r_2)^2/6t\}}. \tag{57}$$

PROOF— The second statement follows immediately from the first one while the third can be proven exactly in the way proposition 93 is proven. □

7 The eta invariant

7.1 The classical eta invariant

The eta invariant of Atiyah Patodi and Singer appears for the first time in the following theorem that we write in the cylindrical case.

THEOREM 7.56 — Let X a compact manifold with boundary Y and product type metric on a collar $Y \times [0, 1]$, attach an infinite cylinder $Y \times [-\infty, 0]$ to get the elongated manifold $\hat{X} := X \cup Y \times [-\infty, 0]$. Let $D : C^\infty(X; E) \longrightarrow C^\infty(X; F)$ a first order differential elliptic operator with product structure near the boundary i.e.

$$D = \sigma(\partial_u + A)$$

where $\sigma E_{|Y} \longrightarrow F_{|Y} E$ is a bundle isomorphism, ∂_u is the normal interior coordinate and A is the boundary self–adjoint elliptic operator. Then the operator D extends to sections of the bundles extended to $\hat{X}$ and has a finite L^2 index i.e the space of L^2 solutions of the equations $Ds = 0$ and $D^* s = 0$ are finite dimensional and

$$\operatorname{ind}(D) = \dim_{L^2(\hat{X},E)}(D) - \dim_{L^2(\hat{X},E)}(D^*) = \int_X \alpha_0(x) dx - \eta(0)/2 - \frac{h_\infty(E) - h_\infty(F)}{2}$$

where

1. $h_\infty(E)$ is the dimension of the space of limiting values of the extended L^2 solutions. More precisely one says that s is an L^2 extended solution of the equation $Ds = 0$ with limiting value s_∞ if s is locally square integrable and for large $u < 0$

   $$s(y,u) = g(y,u) + s_\infty(y),\ s_\infty(y) \in \mathrm{Ker}(A).$$

   Similar definition for $h_\infty(F)$.

2. $\alpha_0(x)$ is the constant term in the asymptotic expansion as $t \to 0$ of

   $$\mathrm{tr}\left(e^{-tD^-D^+}\right) - \mathrm{tr}\left(e^{-tD^+D^-}\right) = \sum e^{-t\mu'}|\phi'_\mu(x)|^2 - \sum e^{-t\mu''}|\phi''_\mu(x)|^2 = \qquad (58)$$

   where μ', ϕ'_μ are the eigenvalues and eigenfunctions of D^*D on the double of X and μ'', ϕ''_μ are the corresponding objects for DD^*.

3. The number $\eta(0)$, is called the spectral asymmetry or the eta invariant of A and is obtained as follows:

   the summation on the non negative eigenvalues of A,

   $$\eta(s) := \sum_{\lambda \neq 0} \mathrm{sign}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-s}$$

   converges absolutely for $\mathrm{Re}(s) >> 0$ extends to a meromorphic function on the whole s–plane with regular value at $s = 0$. Moreover if the asymptotic expansion at (58) has no negative powers of t then $\eta(s)$ is holomorphic for $\mathrm{Re}(s) > -1/2$. That's the case of the Dirac operator of a Riemannian manifold.

7.2 The foliation case

The existence of the eta invariant for the leafwise Dirac operator on a closed foliated manifold was shown by Peric [70] and Ramachandran [76]. In fact they build different invariants, Peric works with the holonomy groupoid of the foliation and Ramachandran with the equivalence relation but the methods are essentially the same. So consider a compact manifold Y with a foliation and a longitudinal Dirac structure i.e. every geometrical structure needed to form a longitudinal Dirac–type operator acting on the tangentially smooth sections of the bundle S, $D : C^\infty_\tau(Y;S) \longrightarrow (Y;S)$. In our index formula Y will be a transverse section of the cylinder sufficiently far from the compact piece and D is the operator at infinity. Suppose also that a transverse holonomy invariant measure Λ is fixed.
Here the first issue to solve is to pass from the summation $\eta(s) = \sum_\lambda \mathrm{sign}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-s}$ which deals with the discrete spectrum to a continuous spectrum and family version. The link is offered by the definition of Euler gamma function

$$\mathrm{sign}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-s} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\lambda e^{-t\lambda^2}dt.$$

Each bounded spectral function of D belongs to the Von Neumann algebra of the foliation arising from the regular representation of the equivalence relation on the Borel field of L^2 spaces of sections of S. Replace the summation by integration w.r.t. the spectral measure of D (definition 4.32) and (formally) change the integration to define the eta function of D as

$$\eta_\Lambda(D;s) := \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mathrm{sign}(\lambda)|\lambda|^{-s}d\mu_D(\lambda) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\int_0^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt. \qquad (59)$$

We shall use also the notation

$$\eta_\Lambda(D;s)_k := \int_k^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt,\ \ \eta_\Lambda(D;s)^k := \int_0^k t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt$$

THEOREM 7.56 — (Ramachandran) The eta function (59) is a well defined meromorphic function for $\mathrm{Re}(s) \leq 0$ with eventually simple poles at $(\dim \mathcal{F} - k)/2$, $k = 0, 1, 2, ...$, $\eta_\Lambda(D;s)$ is regular at 0 and its value $\eta_\Lambda(D;0)$ is called the foliated eta invariant of D.

PROOF— Here a sketch of the proof.

First step. For every $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\mathrm{Re}(s) \leq 0$ the integral

$$\int_1^\infty t^{\frac{s-1}{2}}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt \tag{60}$$

is convergent then in some sense the most important piece of the eta function is the integral $\int_0^1$.

This is reminescent of the remark in the paper of Atiyah Patodi and Singer [5] where they define the function $K(t)$ to be the integral on the cylinder of the difference of the heat kernels $e^{-t\Delta_1} - e^{-t\Delta_2}$ of D and D^*,

$$K(t) = \int_0^\infty \int_{\partial Y} K(t, y, u)dydu = -\sum_\lambda \mathrm{sign}(\lambda)/2\,\mathrm{erf}(|\lambda|\sqrt{t}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{k\geq -n} a_k t^{k/2}$$

where ∂Y is the boundary manifold of dimension n. The remark they do is that the asymptotic expansion is the same replacing the integral with an integral on $\int_{[0,\delta]}$.

The convergence of (60) is proven by simple estimates and the use of the spectral measure. In particular here, by compactness the spectral measure $\mu_{\Lambda,D}$ is tempered i.e.

$$\int \frac{1}{(1+|x|^l)}d\mu_{\Lambda,D} < \infty$$

for some positive l. In fact this measure corresponds to a positive functional [76]

$$I : \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R},\ I(f) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(f(D)).$$

The same is obviously true for the square $D^2 = |D|^2$. Start with $|t^{(s-1)/2}| \leq t^{(\mathrm{Re(s)}-1)/2} \leq t^{-1/2}$, $0 \leq t \leq \infty$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\int_1^\infty |t^{(s-1)/2}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt| &\leq \int_1^\infty |t^{-1/2}|\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2})dt| \\ &\leq \int_1^\infty t^{(s-1)/2}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(|D|e^{-tD^2})dt.\end{aligned}$$

The last integral is equal to

$$\int_1^\infty t^{-1/2}dt \int_0^\infty \lambda^{1/2}e^{-t\lambda}d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda)$$

hence

$$\int_0^\infty \lambda^{1/2} d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda) \int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} e^{-t\lambda} dt = \int_0^\infty \lambda^{1/2} e^{-\lambda} d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda) \int_1^\infty t^{-1/2} e^{-\lambda(t-1)} dt \tag{61}$$

$$= \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda} d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda) \int_0^\infty (u+\lambda)^{-1/2} e^{-u} du$$

$$\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda} d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda) \int_0^\infty u^{-1/2} e^{-u} du$$

$$= \pi^{1/2} \int_0^\infty e^{-\lambda} d\mu_{D^2}(\lambda) = \pi^{1/2} \operatorname{tr}_\Lambda(e^{-D^2}) < \infty$$

Second step. The examination of the finite piece

$$\int_0^1 t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \operatorname{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2}) dt \tag{62}$$

is done using the expansion of the Schwartz kernel of the leafwise operator De^{-tD^2} in fact one can prove that there exists a family of tangentially smooth and locally computable functions $\{\Psi_m\}_{m\geq 0}$ [17] so that the kernel $K_t(x,y,n)$ (n the transverse parameter) of the leafwise bounded operator De^{-tD^2} has the asymptotic expansion

$$K_t(x,x,n) \sim \sum_{m\geq 0} t^{(m-\dim \mathcal{F}-1)/2} \Psi_m(x,n). \tag{63}$$

Moreover $\Psi_m = 0$ for m even. The proof is an adaptation of the classical situation, for example can be found in [80] and [26]. Now, thanks to the expansion (63), since the operator De^{-tD^2} is Λ trace class and the trace is the integral of the Schwartz kernel against the transverse measure we get the corresponding expansion for the trace

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})} \int_0^1 t^{\frac{s-1}{2}} \operatorname{tr}_\Lambda(De^{-tD^2}) dt \sim \sum_{m\geq 0} \frac{2}{s+m-\dim \mathcal{F}} \int_Y \Psi_m d\lambda \tag{64}$$

where $\int \Psi_m d\lambda = \Lambda(\Psi_m dg)$ i.e. is the effect of the integration of the tangential measures $x \longmapsto \Psi_{m|l_x} \times dg_{|l_x}$. From (64) we see that the eta function has a meromorphic continuation to the whole plane with simple (at most) poles at $(\dim \mathcal{F} - k)/2,\ k = 0,1,2,\ldots.$

Third step, regularity at the origin.

If $P = \dim \mathcal{F}$ is even we have said that the coefficients Ψ_m of the development (63) are zero for m even, then the eta function is regular at 0. If p is odd the regularity at zero follows from a very deep result of Bismut and Freed [13]. In fact they showed that the ordinary Dirac operator satisfies a remarkable cancellation property,

$$\operatorname{tr}(De^{-tD^2}) = O(t^{1/2}).$$

Since the Λ–trace can be, as pointed out by Connes ([26]), locally approximated by the regular trace their result applies to our setting to give

$$K_t(x,x,n) \sim \sum_{m\geq p+2} \underbrace{t^{(m-p-1)/2} \Psi(x,n)}_{\text{almost everywhere}},$$

and the regularity at the origin follows immediately.

□

---

[17] in the case of the holonomy groupoid the Ψ_m are locally bounded i.e. bounded on every set in the form of $r^{-1}K$ for K compact in Y

7.3 Eta invariant for perturbations of the Dirac operator

Let Let us consider slightly more general operators

1. $P = D + K$ where $K \in \mathrm{Op}^{-\infty}$ is leafwise uniformly smoothing obtained by functional calculus, $K = f(D)$ where f is bounded Borel function supported in $(-a, a)$.

   Start with the computation

   $$\begin{aligned} Qe^{-tQ^2} - De^{-tD^2} &= De^{-t(D+K)^2} + Ke^{-t(D+K)^2} - De^{-tD^2} \\ &= D\int_0^1 \partial_s e^{-s(D+K)^2-(t-s)D^2}dt + Ke^{-t(D+K)^2} \\ &= Ke^{-t(D+K)^2} - D\int_0^1 e^{-s(D+K)^2}(KD + DK + K^2)e^{(t-s)D^2}ds. \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

   The family (65) converges to 0 as $t \to 0$ in the Frechet topology of kernels in $\mathrm{Op}^{-\infty}$ with uniform transverse control i.e. for kernels $K(x, y, n)$ (n is the transverse parameter) one uses foliated charts to define seminorms that involve derivatives w.r.t. x, y. From (65) one gets the development

   $$\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Qe^{-tQ^2}) \sim_{t\to 0} \sum_{m=0} t^{\frac{m-\dim\mathcal{F}-1}{2}} \int_Y \Psi_j d\Lambda + \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(K) + g(t)$$

   where $g \in C[0, \infty)$ with $g(0) = 0$. Then an asymptotic development for $\eta_\Lambda(Q)(0)_1$ as (64) follows. For the non finite integral $\eta_\Lambda(Q, 0)^1$ no problem in carrying out the estimate (61).

2. The smooth family $u \longmapsto Q_u := D + K + u$. The function $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})$ is smooth (same identical proof as [**?**]) then

   $$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2}) &= \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2} - tQ_u(Q_u' Q_u + Q_u Q_u')e^{-tQ_u^2}) \\ &= (1 + 2t\partial_t)\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2}) \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

   in fact $Q_u' = \mathrm{I}$. By integration

   $$\begin{aligned} \partial_u \eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1 = \partial_u \int_0^1 \frac{t^{(s-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})dt &= \int_0^1 \frac{t^{(s-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}(1 + 2t\partial_t)\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2})dt \\ = \int_0^1 \frac{t^{(s-1)/2}}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-Q_u^2}) &- \frac{s}{\Gamma(\frac{s+1}{2})}\int_0^1 t^{(s-1)/2}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2})dt. \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

   Now, from $Q_u' = \mathrm{I}$ proceed as before using the asymptotic development of the heat kernel for $D + u$ [18]

   $$\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2} = \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u' e^{-tQ_u^2} \sim \sum_{m\geq 0} a_m(D + u)t^{(m-\dim\mathcal{F})/2} + g(t)$$

   where $g \in C[0, \infty)$, $g(0) = 0$. We see that the integral in (67) admits a meromorphic expansion around zero in $\mathbb{C}$ with zero as a pole of almost first order. Then the derivative $\partial_u \eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1$ is holomorphic around zero. The identity

   $$\partial_u \,\mathrm{Res}_{|s=0}\, \eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1 = \mathrm{Res}_{|s=0}\, \partial_u \eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1 = 0$$

   says that $\mathrm{Res}_{|s=0}\, \eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1$ is constant in u then the function $\eta_\Lambda(Q_u, s)_1$ is holomorphic at zero since $\eta_\Lambda(Q_0, s)_1$ is holomorphic in 0.

---

[18] $(D + u)^2$ is a generalized Laplacian

3. Families in the form $Q_u = D + u + \Pi D$ for a spectral projection $\Pi = \chi_{(-a,a)}(D)$.

Proposition 7.57 — The eta invariant for Q_u exists and satisfies

$$\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) = \mathrm{LIM}_{\delta\to 0}\int_\delta^1 \frac{t^{-1/2}}{\gamma(1/2)}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})dt + \int_1^\infty \frac{t^{-1/2}}{\gamma(1/2)}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(Q_u e^{-tQ_u^2})dt$$

where LIM is the constant term in the asimptotic development in powers of δ as $t \to 0$. Moreover for every $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a > 0$,

a. $\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) - \eta_\Lambda(Q_0) = \mathrm{sign}(u)\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\Pi)$

b. $\eta_\Lambda(Q_0) = 1/2\eta_\Lambda(Q_u) + 1/2\eta_\Lambda(Q_{-u})$

c. $|\eta_\Lambda(D) - \eta_\Lambda(Q_0)| = |\eta_\Lambda(\Pi D)| \leq \mu_{\Lambda,D}((-a,a))$.

Proof— The first statement can be proved as above. a. using the spectral measure we have to compute the difference

$$\int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(x+u-\chi x)e^{-t(x+u-\chi x)^2}d\mu_{\Lambda,D}(x)\frac{dt}{\Gamma(1/2)} \\ - \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}\int_{\mathbb{R}}(x-\chi x)e^{-t(x-\chi x)^2}d\mu_{\Lambda,D}(x)\frac{dt}{\Gamma(1/2)}$$

where $\chi = \chi_{(-a,a)}(x)$. Split the integral on $\mathbb{R}$ into two pieces, $|x| > a$ and $|x| \leq a$. First case $|x| > a$ changing the integration order the first integral is

$$\Gamma(1/2)^{-1}\int_{|x|>a}\int_0^\infty (x+u)t^{-1/2}e^{-t(x+u)^2}dtd\mu_{\Lambda,D}(x)$$

and performing the substitution $\sigma := t(x+u)^2$ in the second we see that the difference is zero.
Second case $|x| < a$, the second integral is zero, the first

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}\int_{-a}^a ue^{-tu^2}d\mu_{\Lambda,D}(x)\frac{dt}{\Gamma(1/2)} = \int_0^\infty t^{-1/2}ue^{-tu^2}\frac{dt}{\Gamma(1/2)}\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\Pi) \\
&= \underbrace{\int_0^\infty u|u|\sigma^{-1/2}e^{-\sigma}\frac{d\sigma}{|u|^2}}_{tu^2=\sigma}\frac{\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\Pi)}{\Gamma(1/2)} = \mathrm{sign}(u)\frac{\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\Pi)}{\Gamma(1/2)}\int_0^\infty \sigma^{-1/2}e^{-\sigma^2}d\sigma \qquad (68) \\
&= \mathrm{sign}(u)\,\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\Pi).
\end{aligned}$$

b. and c. follows easily from a. □

8 The index formula

First we introduce the supertrace notation. Since the bundle $E = E^+ \oplus E^-$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2$–graded, there is a canonical Random operator τ obtained by passing to the Λ–class of the family of involutions $\tau_x : L^2(L_x;E) \longrightarrow L^2(L_x;E)$ represented w.r.t. the splitting by matrices

$$\tau_x := \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{Id}_{L^2(L_x;E^+)} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathrm{Id}_{L^2(L_x;E^-)} \end{pmatrix}.$$

DEFINITION 8.58 — The Λ–supertrace of $B \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(E)$ is $\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(B) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(\tau B)$.

Now according to proposition 5.40 for $0 < |u| < \epsilon$ the perturbed operator $D_{\epsilon,u}$ is Λ–Breuer–Fredholm. Consider the heat operator $e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,x}}$ on the leaf L_x. This is a uniformly smoothing operator with a Schwartz kernel (remember that the metric trivializes densities and $[\bullet]$ means Schwartz kernel)

$$[e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,x}}] \in UC^\infty(L_x \times L_x; \mathrm{End}(E)).$$

It is a well know fact the convergence for $t \longrightarrow \infty$ in the Frechet space of UC^∞ sections of the heat kernel to the kernel of the projection on the L^2–Kernel,

$$\lim_{t\longrightarrow\infty} [e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,x}}] = [\chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u,x})].$$

This is explained in proposition A.19, page 108 and is a consequence of continuity of the functional calculus $RB(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow UC^\infty(\mathrm{End(E)})$ applied to the sequence of functions $e^{-t\lambda^2} \longrightarrow \chi_{\{0\}}$ in $RB(\mathbb{R})$. Choose cut–off functions $\phi_k \in C_c^\infty(X)$ such that $\phi_{k|X_k} = 1$, $\phi_{k|Z_{k+1}} = 0$. The measurable family of bounded operators $\{\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,x}} \phi_k\}_{x\in X}$ gives an intertwining operator $\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k \in \mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(L^2(E))$ hence a random operator $\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(L^2(E))$.

LEMMA 8.59 — The random operator $\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(L^2(E))$ is Λ–trace class. The following formula (iterated limit) holds true

$$\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) = \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u})) = \lim_{k\longrightarrow\infty} \lim_{t\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k). \tag{69}$$

PROOF— For the first statement there's nothing to proof, it is essentially the closed foliated manifold case. The local traces define a tangential measure that are C^∞ in the leaves direction while Borel and uniformely bounded (by the uniform ellipticity of the operator) and we are integrating against the transverse measure on a compact set. More precisely we are evaluating the mass of a compact set through the measure Λ_h where h is the longitudinal measure that on the leaf L_x is given by

$$A \longmapsto \int_A \mathrm{str}_{\mathrm{End}(E)} [e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}]_{\mathrm{diag}} dg_{|L_x},$$

with $\mathrm{str}_{\mathrm{End}(E)}$ the pointwise supertrace defined on the space of sections of $\mathrm{End}(E) \to X$ by $(\mathrm{str}_{\mathrm{End}(E)}\, \gamma)(x) := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathrm{end}(E_x)}(\tau(x)\gamma(x))$.
The limit formula (69) is nothing but the Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem applied two times, first $\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u})) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k \chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u})\phi_k)$ but for fixed k one finds $\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k \chi_{\{0\}}(D_{\epsilon,u}))\phi_k) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k)$. The possibility to apply the dominated convergence theorem is given again by the integration process in fact as written above every tangential measure has smooth density w.r.t to the Riemannian metric and convergence is within the Frechet topology of C^∞ functions.

□

Now, Duhamel formula $d/dt\, \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) = -\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k)$ integrated between s and ∞ leads to the identity

$$\lim_{t\longrightarrow\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) = \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) - \int_s^\infty \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) dt.$$

Note that the right–hand side is independent from $s > 0$. Then

$$\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\left[\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k) - \int_s^\infty \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt\right]. \tag{70}$$

Split the integral into

$$\int_s^\infty \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt = \int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt + \int_{\sqrt{k}}^\infty \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt.$$

Make the following definitions

$$\alpha_0(k,s) = \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k), \qquad \beta_0(k,s) = \textstyle\int_s^\infty \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt$$

$$\beta_{01}(k,s) = \textstyle\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt, \qquad \beta_{02}(k,s) = \textstyle\int_{\sqrt{k}}^\infty \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)dt$$

Then $\beta_0(k,s) = \beta_{01}(k,s) + \beta_{02}(k,s)$ and

$$\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) = \lim_{k\to\infty}[\alpha_0(k,s) - \beta_0(k,s)] = [\alpha_0(k,s) - \beta_{01}(k,s) - \beta_{02}(k,s)]. \tag{71}$$

Let us start with β_{01}.

LEMMA 8.60 — Let $\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u})$ be the Ramachandran eta–invariant for the perturbed operator $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}$ on the foliation at the infinity. Then the following limit formula is true

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\beta_{01}(k,s) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k)ds, = 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u})$$

where as usual $\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0} g(s)$ is the constant term in the expansion of $g(s)$ in powers of s near zero.

PROOF— The integrand can be written as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k) =& 1/2\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k[D_{\epsilon,u}, D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}]\phi_k) & (72)\\ =& 1/2\operatorname{str}_\Lambda([D_{\epsilon,u}, \phi_k D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k] - [D_{\epsilon,u},\phi_k^2]D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}) & (73)\\ =& 1/2\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(-[D_{\epsilon,u},\phi_k^2]D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}})\\ =& -1/2\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r(\phi_k^2)D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}).\end{aligned}$$

In the next we shall use the notation $[a,b] := ab - (-1)^{|a|\cdot|b|}ba$ for the Lie–superbracket[19] on the Lie–superalgebra of $\mathbb{C}$–linear endomorphisms of $L^2(X, E^+\oplus E^-)$ while, when the standard bracket is needed we write $[a,b]_\circ := ab - ba$. notice that

$$[\alpha, ab] = [\alpha, a]b + (-1)^{|\alpha|\cdot|a|}a[\alpha, b].$$

Remember the definition of $D_{\epsilon,u}$, in the cylinder it can be written

$$D_{\epsilon,u} = D + \dot{\theta}\Omega(u - D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + Q$$

---

[19] everything we say about super–algebras can be found in [10]

with the Clifford multiplication $c(\partial_r) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and Q is $\mathbb{R}^+$–invariant in fact acts on the transverse section. The next identities are also useful

$$D_{\epsilon,u} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^-_{\epsilon,u} \\ D^+_{\epsilon,u} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-tD^-_{\epsilon,u}D^+_{\epsilon,u}} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-tD^+_{\epsilon,u}D^-_{\epsilon,u}} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$D^-_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^+_{\epsilon,u}D^-_{\epsilon,u}} = e^{-tD^-_{\epsilon,u}D^+_{\epsilon,u}}D^-_{\epsilon,u}, \quad D^+_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^-_{\epsilon,u}D^+_{\epsilon,u}} = e^{-tD^+_{\epsilon,u}D^-_{\epsilon,u}}D^+_{\epsilon,u}.$$

These are nothing but a rephrasing of the identity

$$D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} = e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}D_{\epsilon,u}$$

granted by the spectral theorem. Now it's time to use the Cheeger–Gromov–Taylor relative estimates. Consider the leafwise operator

$$S_{\epsilon,u} := c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega(u - D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) \tag{74}$$

on the infinite foliated cylinder (in both directions) $Y = \partial X_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ with the product foliation $\mathcal{F}_\partial \times \mathbb{R}$. Choose some point $z_0 = (x_0, r)$ on the cylinder. Estimate (57) says that we can compare the two kernels at the diagonal leaf by leaf for large r and this estimate is uniform on the leaves,

$$\|[D_{\epsilon,u,z_0}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,x_0}}] - [S_{\epsilon,u,z_0}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u,z_0}}]\|_{(z,z)} \leq Ce^{-(r-r_2)^2/(6t)} \tag{75}$$

for $\underline{z = (x,r) \in L_{z_0}}$. From (75), since the derivatives of ϕ_k are supported on the cylindrical portion $Z_k^{k+1} = \partial X_0 \times [k, k+1]$,

$$\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} |\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}) - \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 S_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u}})|dt = \int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_{Z_k^{k+1}} \Theta(z,t)d\Lambda_g dt$$

where Λ_g is the coupling of Λ with the tangential Riemannian measure and $\Theta(z,r)$ is the function

$$\Theta(z,r) := \|c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2[D_{\epsilon,u,z}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u,z}} - S_{\epsilon,u,z}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u,z}}]\|_{(z,z)}.$$

Let $\mathcal{T}_k$ be a transversal of the foliation $\mathcal{F}_k$ induced on the slice $\{r = k\}$ then $\mathcal{T}_k$ is also transversal for $\mathcal{F}$ (since the boundary foliation has the same codimension of $\mathcal{F}$). The transverse measure Λ defines also a transverse measure on the boundary foliation. Then the foliation $\mathcal{F}_{|Z_k^{k+1}}$ is fibering on $\mathcal{T}_k$ as in the diagram $\partial\mathcal{F} \times [k, k+1] \longrightarrow \mathcal{T}_k$. Use this fibration to disintegrate the measure Λ_g. This is splitted into $d\Lambda_\partial \times dr$ where Λ_∂ is the measure obtained applying the integration process of Λ (restricted to $\mathcal{F}_k$) to the $g_{|\partial}$. In local coordinates $(r, x_1, ..., x_{2p-1}) \times (x_{2p}, ..., x_n)$ the transversal is decomposed into pieces $\mathcal{T}_k = \{(k, x_1^0, ..., x_{2p-1}^0)\} \times \{(x_{2p}, ..., x_n)\}$ and we are taking integrals

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}_k \times \{x_1,...,x_{2p-1}\}}\int_{[k,k+1]} \Theta(r, x_1, ..., x_{2p-1}, x_{2p}, ..., x_n)dr\, \underbrace{dx_1 \cdots dx_{2p-1}d\Lambda(x_{2p}, .., x_n)}_{\text{this is } d\Lambda_\partial} \tag{76}$$

$$=: \int_{\mathcal{F}_k}\int_{[k,k+1]} \Theta(x,r)d\Lambda_\partial dr.$$

Equation (76) can be taken as a definition of a notation that will be used next. Notice that $\int_{\mathcal{F}_k}$ contains a slight abuse of notation, in fact to follow rigorously the integration recipe one should write $\int_{\partial X_0\times\{k\}}$. We prefer the first to stress the fact that we are splitting w.r.t the foliation induced on the transversal. With this notation in mind,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} |\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}}) - \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 S_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u}})|dt \\
&\qquad = \int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_{\mathcal{F}_z}\int_{[k,k+1]} \|c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2[D_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} - S_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u}}]\|_{((x,r),(x,r))}drd\Lambda_\partial dt \qquad (77)\\
&\qquad \le C\int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_k^{k+1} e^{-(r-3)^2/6t}drdt \le C\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} e^{-(k-3)^2/6t}dt \\
&\qquad \le C\int_{1/\sqrt{k}}^{1/s} y^{-2}e^{-(k-3)^2y/6}dy \le C(e^{-k^{3/2}/c_1} + e^{-c_2/s})
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently small[20] s and large k. This estimate says that

$$\lim_{k\to+\infty}\mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0}\,\beta_{01}(k,s) = \lim_{k\to+\infty}\mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0}\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 S_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u}})dt.$$

Now the second integral (on the cylinder) is explicitly computable in fact the Schwartz kernel of the operator $S_{\epsilon,u,z_0}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u,z_0}}$ on the diagonal is easily checked to be

$$\begin{aligned}
&\big[S_{\epsilon,u,z_0}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u,z_0}}\big]_{(z,z)} \\
=&\big(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x_0}\Omega + c(\partial_r)\partial_r\big)\left(\big[e^{-t(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x_0}\Omega)^2}\big]_{(x,y)}\frac{e^{-(r-s)^2/(4t)}}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\right)\Bigg|_{y=x,\, s=r} \\
=&\frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\Omega\big[D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x_0}e^{-tD^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x_0}}\big]_{(x,x)}, \quad z=(x,r)
\end{aligned}$$

i.e. it does not depend on the cylindrical coordinate r. Now the pointwise supertrace on $\mathrm{End}(E)$ is related to the trace on the positive boundary eigenbundle F via the identity (see the appendix on Clifford algebras)

$$\operatorname{str}^E(c(\partial_r)\Omega\bullet) = -2\operatorname{tr}^F(\bullet),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(c(\partial_r)\partial_r\phi_k^2 S_{\epsilon,u}e^{-tS^2_{\epsilon,u}})dt \\
&\qquad\qquad = -2\int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_k^{k+1}\partial_r\phi_k^2dr\int_{\mathcal{F}_0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\operatorname{tr}^F[D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x}e^{-t(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x})^2}]_{(x,x)}\cdot d\Lambda_\partial dt \\
&\qquad\qquad =2\int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_{\mathcal{F}_0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi t}}\operatorname{tr}^F[D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x}e^{-t(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x})^2}]_{(x,x)}\cdot d\Lambda_\partial dt \\
&\qquad\qquad =\int_s^{\sqrt{k}}\int_{\mathcal{F}_0}\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}}\operatorname{tr}^F[D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x}e^{-t(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x})^2}]_{(x,x)}\cdot d\Lambda_\partial dt,
\end{aligned}$$

---

[20] $y^se^{-ay^2} \le (\frac{s}{2ae})^{s/2}$ for $s,u,y,a>0$

with the same argument on the splitting of measures as above. Finally it is clear from our discussion on the η–invariant (exactly proposition 7.57)

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0}\,\beta_{01}(k,s)\\ &\qquad = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0} \int_s^{\sqrt{k}} \int_{\mathcal{F}_0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi t}} \operatorname{tr}^F [D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x} e^{-t(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u,x})^2}]_{(x,x)} \cdot d\Lambda_\partial dt = 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}).\end{aligned}$$

□

LEMMA 8.61 — Since $D_{\epsilon,u}$ is Λ–Breuer–Fredholm for $0<|u|<\epsilon$ then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_{02}(k,s) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) dt = 0.$$

PROOF— From the very definition of the Λ–essential spectrum (see also lemma 4.31) there exists some $\sigma=\sigma(u)>0$ such that the projection $\Pi_\sigma = \chi_{[-\sigma,\sigma]}(D_{\epsilon,u})$ has finite Λ–trace. Then

$$\begin{aligned}|\beta_{02}(k,s)| &= \Big| \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k) dt \Big| \\ &\le \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} |\,\mathrm{str}_\Lambda[\phi_k D_{\epsilon,u} e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u}/2} (1-\Pi_\sigma) e^{-(t-1)D^2_{\epsilon,u}} e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u}/2} D_{\epsilon,u}\phi_k]| dt \\ &+ \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} |\,\mathrm{str}_\Lambda[e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}/2} \Pi_\sigma D_{\epsilon,u} \phi_k^2 D_{\epsilon,u} \Pi_\sigma e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}/2}]| dt \\ &\le \underbrace{\int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} e^{-(t-1)\sigma} |\,\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u}} \phi_k)| dt}_{\beta_{021}(k,s)} + \underbrace{\int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} |\,\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \Pi_\sigma)| dt}_{\beta_{022}(k,s)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the Schwartz kernel of $(D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u}})_x$ is uniformly bounded in x and varies in a Borel fashion transversally. When forming the Λ–supertrace we are integrating a longitudinal measure with C^∞–density w.r.t. the longitudinal measure given by the Riemannian density. Let as usual Λ_g the measure given by the integration of the Riemannian longitudinal measure with the transverse measure Λ. If A is a uniform bound on the leafwise Schwartz kernels of $(D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u}})$, and $\mathcal{T}_0$ is a complete transversal contained in the normal section of the cylinder (the same in lemma 8.60), we can extimate

$$\beta_{021}(k,s) \le \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} A(\Lambda_g(X_0) + \Lambda(\mathcal{T}_{\prime})k) e^{-(t-1)\sigma} dt \longrightarrow_{k\to\infty} 0.$$

For the second addendum,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{022}(k,s) &= \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} |\,\mathrm{str}_\Lambda(D^2_{\epsilon,u} e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} \Pi_\sigma)| dt \le \int_{\sqrt{k}}^{\infty} \int_{-\sigma}^{\sigma} x^2 e^{-tx^2} d\mu_{\Lambda,D_{\epsilon,u}}(x) dt \\ &= \int_{-\sigma}^{\sigma} e^{-\sqrt{k}x^2} \int_0^{\infty} x^2 e^{-tx^2} dt d\mu_{\Lambda,D_{\epsilon,u}}(x) \\ &\le C \int_{-\sigma}^{\sigma} e^{-\sqrt{k}x^2} d\mu_{\Lambda,D_{\epsilon,u}}(x) \le C\mu_{\Lambda,D_{\epsilon,u}}(x)([-\sigma,\sigma]) \longrightarrow_{k\to\infty} 0\end{aligned}$$

since the Λ–essential spectrum of $D_{\epsilon,u}$ has a gap around zero and the normality property of the trace. $\square$

It is time to update equation (71),

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) &= \lim_{k\to\infty}[\alpha_0(k,s)-\beta_0(k,s)] = \lim_{k\to\infty}[\alpha_0(k,s)-\beta_{01}(k,s)-\beta_{02}(k,s)] \\ &= \lim_{k\to\infty}\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\alpha_0(k,s) - 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}). \qquad (78)\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.62 — There exists a function $g(u)$ with $\lim_{u\to 0} g(u) = 0$ such that for $0<\epsilon<u$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\alpha_0(k,s) = \lim_{k\to\infty}\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}}\phi_k) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(\mathrm{E/S}), C_\Lambda\rangle + g(u).$$

Here the leafwise characteristic form $\hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(\mathrm{E/S})$ is supported on X_0, in particular it belongs to the domain of the Ruelle–Sullivan current C_Λ associated to the transverse measure Λ.

Proof— This is the investigation of the behavior of the local supertrace of the family of the leafwise heat kernels

$$\operatorname{str}^E[e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}}]_{|\operatorname{diag}}$$

on the leafwise diagonals. We can do it dividing into three separate cases

1. For $z\in X_0$ everything goes as in the classical computation by Gilkey [35] and Atiyah Bott and Patodi [3]

   $$\operatorname{LIM}_{s\to 0}\operatorname{str}^E[e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,z}}]_{(x,x)}dg_z = \hat{A}(X,\nabla)\operatorname{Ch}(E/S,\nabla)(x),$$

   where dg_z is the Riemannian density on the leaf L_z.

2. In the middle, $z\in\partial X_0\times[0,4]$ there's the cause of the presence of the defect function $g(u)$, more precisely we show that the asymptotic development of the local supertrace is the same for the comparison operator $S_{0,u}$ defined above

   $$\operatorname{str}^E([e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,z}}])_{(z,z)} \simeq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j(S_{0,u})_{(z)} s^{(j-\dim\mathcal{F})/2}$$

   with coefficients $a_j(S_{0,u})$ smoothly depending on u satisfying $a_j(S_{0,u})=0$ for $j\le \dim\mathcal{F}/2$

3. Away from the base of the cylinder $z=(y,r)\in Z$ $r>4$ we find

   $$[e^{-D^2_{\epsilon,u,z}}]_{(y,r)}=0.$$

Below the proofs of these facts.

1. We can consider the doubled manifold $2X_0$ so that we can apply the relative estimate of type Cheeger–Gromov–Taylor in the non–cylindrical case (the perturbation starts from the cylinder) i.e. proposition 6.52 shows that the two Schwartz kernels of the Dirac operator and the perturbed operator $D_{\epsilon,u}$ have the same development as $t\to 0$,

   $$\|[e^{-tD^2_{\epsilon,u}} - e^{-tD^2}]_{(x,x)}\| \le Ke^{-\alpha/(6t)}.$$

   And the local computation of Atiyah Bott and Patodi, or the Getzler rescaling ([62],[34]) can be performed as in the classical situation.

2. We are going to use an argument of comparison with the leafwise operator

$$S_{\epsilon,u} := c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + \dot{\theta}(u - \Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}))$$

on the infinite cylinder $\partial X_0 \times \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the product foliation $\mathcal{F}_\partial \times \mathbb{R}$. Notice that, due to the presence of $\dot{\theta}$ this is a slightly different form of the operator (74). Choose some function ψ_1 supported in $\partial X_0 \times [-1, 5]$ and $\psi_{1|\partial X_0 \times [0,4]} = 1$. The first fact we show is

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1(e^{-sS^2_{\epsilon,u}} - e^{-sS^2_{0,u}})\psi_1) = 0.$$

Now, $S_{\epsilon,u} = S_{0,u} - \Omega\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} = c(\partial_r)\partial_r + H$ with $H = \Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + \Omega\dot{\theta}u$ hence

$$\begin{aligned} S^2_{\epsilon,u} - S^2_{0,u} &= -[S_{0,u}, \Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}] + (\Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})^2 \\ &= -[c(\partial_r)\partial_r, \Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}] - [H, \Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}] + (\Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})^2 \\ &= -\Phi\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} - 2(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} + \dot{\theta}u)(\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) + (\Omega\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})^2. \end{aligned} \tag{79}$$

Apply the Duhamel formula

$$\begin{aligned} &|\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1(S^2_{\epsilon,u} - S^2_{0,u})\psi_1| \\ &\qquad = \left|\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1 e^{-\delta S^2_{0,u}} e^{-(s-\delta)S^2_{\epsilon,u}}\psi_1)_{(\delta=s)} - \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1 e^{-\delta S^2_{0,u}} e^{-(s-\delta)S^2_{\epsilon,u}}\psi_1)_{(\delta=0)}\right| \\ &\qquad = \left|\int_0^s \operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1^2\Pi_\epsilon)e^{-\delta S^2_{0,u}}(S^2_{\epsilon,u} - S^2_{0,u})\Pi_\epsilon e^{-(s-\delta)S^2_{\epsilon,u}} d\delta\right|. \end{aligned}$$

Again from the Cheeger–Gromov relative estimates (56)

$$|\operatorname{tr}_\Lambda(\psi_1 e^{-\delta S^2_u}\Pi_\epsilon\psi_1)| \leq C\delta^{-1/2}$$

$$\|(S^2_{\epsilon,u} - S^2_{0,u})\Pi_\epsilon e^{-(s-\delta)S^2_{\epsilon,u}}\| \leq C(s-\delta)^{-1/2}$$

with the constants independent from $|u| < \epsilon$. Then the integral of the supertrace (79) can be estimated by the function of s, $h(s) = C\int_0^s (s-\delta)^{-1/2}\delta^{-1/2}d\delta \longrightarrow_{s\to 0} 0$. . To see this first split the integral into $\int_0^{s/2} + \int_{s/2}^s$ to prove finiteness then use the absolutely continuity of the integral for convergence to zero. Now from the limit $\lim_{s\to 0}\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\psi_1(e^{-sS^2_{\epsilon,u}} - e^{-sS^2_{0,u}})\psi_1) = 0$ and the comparison argument we get that the asymptotic expansion for $s \to 0$ of $\operatorname{str}_\Lambda(\phi_k e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u}\phi_k})$ is the same of the comparison operator

$$S_{0,u} = \underbrace{c(\partial_r)\partial_r + \Omega D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}}_{D} + \underbrace{\qquad \dot{\vartheta}u\Omega \qquad}_{\text{bounded perturbation}}$$

on the infinite cylinder. This is a very simple u–family of generalized laplacians (see [10] Chapter 2.7) and the Duhamel formula

$$e^{-tS^2_{0,u}} - e^{-tS^2_{0,0}} = -\int_0^u t\dot{\vartheta}\Omega e^{-tS_{0,v}} dv ds$$

shows what is written in the statement i.e.

$$\operatorname{str}^E([e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,z}}])_{(z,z)} \simeq \sum_{j\in\mathbb{N}} a_j(S_{0,u})_{(z)} s^{(j-\dim\mathcal{F})/2}$$

where the coefficients $a_j(S_{0,u})$ depend smoothly on u and satisfy $a_j(S_{0,u}) = 0$ for $j \leq \dim\mathcal{F}/2$ since $S_{0,0}$ is the Cylindrical Dirac operator. One can take for the definition of g,

$$g(u) := \sum_{j=0}^{\dim\mathcal{F}/2} \int_{\partial X_0 \times [0,4]} a_j(S_{0,u})_{(z)} s^{(j-\dim\mathcal{F})/2} d\Lambda_g.$$

3. This is done again by comparison with $S_{\epsilon,u}$ consider the r–depending family of tangential tangential measures $(y,r) \in \partial X_0 \times [a,b] \longmapsto \mathrm{str}^E\, e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,(x,r)}}dxdr$ where $x \in L_{(y,r)}$, once coupled with $d\Lambda$ gives a measure on X $\mu := \mathrm{str}^E\, e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,(x,r)}}dxdr \cdot d\Lambda$. The Fubini theorem can certainly used during the integration process to find out that the mass of μ can be computed integrating first the r–depending tangential measures $y \longmapsto \mathrm{str}^E\, e^{-sD^2_{\epsilon,u,(y,r)}}dy$ against Λ on the foliation at infinity $(\partial X_0, \mathcal{F}_\partial)$ then the resulting function of r on $[a,b]$,

$$\mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0} \int_{\partial X_0 \times [a,b]} d\mu = \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0} \int_a^b \int_{\partial X_0} \mathrm{str}^E([e^{-sS^2_{\epsilon,u}}])_{(y,r),(y,r)})dy \cdot d\Lambda dx$$
$$= \mathrm{LIM}_{s\to 0} \frac{b-a}{\sqrt{4\pi s}} \mathrm{str}_\Lambda(e^{-s(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u})^2}) = 0$$

in fact the boundary operator $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}$ is invertible and the well–known Mc–Kean–Singer formula for foliations on compact ambient manifolds (formula (7.39) in [65]) says that $\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) = \mathrm{str}_\Lambda\, e^{-s(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u})^2}$ independently from s.

□

Finally (78) becomes

$$\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), C_\Lambda\rangle - 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) + g(u). \tag{80}$$

Theorem 8.62 — The Dirac operator has finite dimensional $L^2 - \Lambda$–index and the following formula holds

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+) = \langle \hat{A}(X)\,\mathrm{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) - h^+_\Lambda + h^-_\Lambda] \tag{81}$$

where

$$h^\pm_\Lambda := \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm) - \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm) \tag{82}$$

with the dimension of the space of extended solutions as defined in the definition 5.45 after the remark i.e.

$$\dim_\Lambda \mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm) := \dim_\Lambda \overline{\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm)}^{e^{u\theta}L^2}$$

independently from small $u > 0$.

Proof— Start from

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+_\epsilon) = \lim_{u\downarrow 0} 1/2\{\mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) + \mathrm{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,-u}) + h^-_{\Lambda,\epsilon} - h^+_{\Lambda,\epsilon}\}, \tag{83}$$

here $h^\pm_{\Lambda,\epsilon} = \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_\epsilon)) - \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_\epsilon))$ for now proposition 5.43 says that

$$\mathrm{Ext}(D^\pm_\epsilon) = \mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm_{\epsilon,\pm}) = \mathrm{Ker}_{e^{u\theta}L^2}(D^\pm_\epsilon).$$

Use the identity $\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^+_{\epsilon,u}) = \langle A(\hat{X})\operatorname{Ch}(E/S),[C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) + g(u)$ into (83),

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+_\epsilon) &= \lim_{u\downarrow 0} 1/2\Big\{2\langle \hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(E/S),[C_\Lambda]\rangle + h^-_{\Lambda,\epsilon} - h^+_{\Lambda,\epsilon} + g(u) + g(-u) \\ &\qquad \underbrace{+1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,u}) + 1/2\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon,-u})}_{\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon})\text{ by proposition }7.57}\Big\} \\ &= \langle \hat{A}(X)\operatorname{Ch}(E/S),[C_\Lambda]\rangle + \frac{h^-_{\Lambda,\epsilon} - h^+_{\Lambda,\epsilon}}{2} + \frac{\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_{\epsilon})}{2}.\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

It remains to pass to the ϵ–limit remembering that:

- $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+_\epsilon) = \operatorname{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^+)$ (Proposition 5.46),
- $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0} h^-_{\Lambda,\epsilon} - h^+_{\Lambda,\epsilon} = h^- - h^+$ (again proposition 5.46)
- $\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}_\epsilon) = \eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})$ (proposition 7.57).

□

9 Comparison with Ramachandran index formula

The Ramachandran index formula [76] stands into index theory for foliations exactly as the Atiyah–Patodi–Singer formula stays in the classical theory. Our formula is in some sense the cylindrical point of view of this formula. In this section we prove that the two formulas are compatible and we do it exactly in the way it is done for the single leaf case by APS. First we recall the Ramachandran Theorem

9.1 The Ramachandran index

Since we have chosen an opposite orientation for the boundary foliation the Ramachandran index formula here written differs from the original in [76] exactly for its sign (as in section 3 for the APS formula). So let us consider the Dirac operator builded in section 2 but acting only on the foliation restricted to the compact manifold with boundary X_0. To be precise with notation let us call $\mathcal{F}_0$ the foliation restricted to X_0 with leaves $\{L^0_x\}_x$, equivalence relation $\mathcal{R}_0$ and $D^{\mathcal{F}_0}$ the Dirac operator acting on the field of Hilbert spaces $\{L^2(L^0_x;E)\}_{x\in X_0}$. Near the boundary

$$D^{\mathcal{F}_0} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D^{\mathcal{F}_0^-} \\ D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} \\ \partial_r + D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with the boundary operator $D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}$. Let us consider the field of APS boundary conditions

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \chi_{[0,\infty)}(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) & 0 \\ 0 & \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{I}-P \end{pmatrix}$$

acting on the boundary foliation. In the order of ideas of Ramachandran paper (coming back from an idea of John Roe) this is a self adjoint boundary condition i.e. its interacts with the Dirac operator in the following way:

1. B is a field of bounded self–adjoint operators with $\sigma B + B\sigma = \sigma$ where σ is Clifford multiplication by the unit (interior) normal.

2. If b is the operator of restriction to the boundary acting on smooth sections then $(s_1, D^{\mathcal{F}_0} s_2) = (D^{\mathcal{F}_0} s_1, s_2)$ for every couple of smooth sections s_1 and s_2 such that $Bbs_1 = 0$ and $Bbs_2 = 0$.

Next Ramachandran proves using the generalized eigenfunction expansion of Browder and Gårding, that there's a field of restriction operators

$$H^k(X_0; E) \longrightarrow H^{k-1/2}(X_0; E)$$

extending b where the Sobolev spaces are defined taking into account the boundary i.e. for a leaf L^0_x, the space $H^k(L^0_x; E)$ is the completion of $C^\infty_c(L^0_x; E)$ (compact support possibly meeting the boundary) w.r.t. the usual L^2–based Sobolev norms. It follows from the restriction theorem that one can define the domain of D with boundary condition B as $H^\infty(X_0; E, B) := \{s \in H^\infty(X_0; E) : Bbs = 0\}$.

Theorem 9.62 — (Ramachandran [76]) The family of unbounded operators D with domain $H^\infty(X_0; E, B)$ is essentially self–adjoint and Breuer–Fredholm in the Von Neumann algebra of the foliation with finite Λ–index in the sense of $\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_0}) = \dim_\Lambda(\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+})) - \dim_\Lambda(\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^-}))$ given by the formula

$$\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_0}) = \langle \hat{A}(X) \operatorname{Ch}(E/S), [C_\Lambda] \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}}_0) - h] \tag{85}$$

Now we are going to prove compatibility between formula (85) and (81). First of all we have to relate the two Von Neumann algebras in play. Denote (according to our notation) with $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0}(E)$ the space of intertwining operators of the representation of $\mathcal{R}_0$ on $L^2(E)$ and, only in this section $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(E)$ the resulting Von Neumann algebra with trace $\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}$ in order to make distinction from $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(E)$ the Von Neumann algebra of random operators associated with the representation of $\mathcal{R}$. Start with a measurable fields of bounded operators $X_0 \ni B_x \longmapsto B_x : L^2(L^0_x; E) \longrightarrow L^2(L^0_x; E)$ with $B_x = B_y$ a.e. if $(x, y) \in \mathcal{R}_0$. There's a natural way to extend B to a field of operators in $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(E)$.

1. If $x \in X_0$ simply let $\imath B_x$ act to $L^2(L_x; E)$ to be zero on the cylinder

   $$\imath B_x : L^2(L^0_x; E) \oplus L^2(\partial L^0_x \times (0, \infty); E) \longrightarrow L^2(L^0_x; E) \oplus L^2(\partial L^0_x \times (0, \infty); E)$$

   $\imath B_x(s, t) := (B_x s, 0)$.

2. If $x \in \partial X_0 \times (0, \infty)$ define $\imath B_x := \imath B_{p(x)}$ where $p : \partial X_0 \times (0, \infty) \longrightarrow \partial X_0$ is the base projection and $\imath B_{p(x)}$ is defined by point 1.

Proposition 9.63 — The map $\imath : \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0}(E) \longrightarrow \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}}(E)$ as defined above passes to the quotient to an injection

$$\imath : \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(E) \longrightarrow \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(E)$$

between the Von Neumannn algebras of Random operators preserving the two natural traces

$$\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(\imath B) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(B).$$

Proof— The first part is clear. An intertwining operator $B = \{B_x\}_{x \in X_0}$ is zero Λ–a.e. in X_0 then also does $\imath B$ in X for any transversal T contained in the cylinder can slide by holonomy to a transversal contained in X_0. About the identity on traces remember the link between the direct integral algebras and the algebras of random operators i.e. Lemma 4.6. Choose ν to be the longitudinal Riemannnian metric then Λ_ν is the integration of ν against Λ. Let P_0 be the Von Neumann algebra of Λ_ν–a.e. classes of measurable fields of operators $X_0 \ni x \longmapsto B_x \in B(L^2(L^0_x;E))$ and P the corresponding algebra builded replacing X_0 with X and $B(L^2(L^0_x;E))$ with $B(L^2(L^0_x;E))$. Notice that the family

$$X \ni y \longmapsto \int \imath B_x d\nu^y \tag{86}$$

is bounded for B in the domain of $\imath$ then Lemma 4.6 says that

$$\operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(\imath B) = \int_X \operatorname{Trace}(B_x)d\Lambda_\nu(x) = \int_{X_0} \operatorname{Trace}(B_x)d\Lambda_\nu(x) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(B).$$

□

THEOREM 9.63 — Let $\operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^\pm}) \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(E)$ the projection on the Kernel of $D^{\mathcal{F}_0^\pm}$ with domain given by the boundary condition $Px = 0$, $(\mathrm{I} - P = 0)$ as in Ramachandran formula. Let also $\operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^\pm) \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(E)$ be the projection on the L^2–kernel of the leafwise operator on the foliation with the cylinder attached and $\operatorname{Pr}\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(D^\pm)} \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(e^{u\theta}L^2E)$ be the projection on the closure of the space of extended solution seen in $e^{u\theta}$ for sufficiently small positive u.

1. $\imath \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+})$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)$ in $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(E)$ i.e. there exists a partial isometry $u \in \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}(E)$ such that

$$u^*u = \imath \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+}), \quad uu^* = \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)$$

. In particular

$$\dim_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+}) = \dim_{\mathcal{R},\Lambda}\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+).$$

2. $$\imath \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^-}) \sim \operatorname{Pr}\overline{\operatorname{Ext}(D^-)}^{e^{u\theta}L^2},$$

for sufficiently small u and equivalence in $\operatorname{End}_\Lambda(e^{u\theta}L^2(E))$ with the inclusion

$$\imath : \operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{R}_0,\Lambda}(E) \longrightarrow \operatorname{End}_\Lambda(e^{u\theta}L^2(E))$$

defined as in proposition 9.63.

As a consequence

$$\dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^-}) = \dim_\Lambda \operatorname{Ext}(D^-).$$

PROOF— The idea is contained in A.P.S. [5] when they prove the equivalence between the boundary value problem and the L^2 cylindrical problem. Their main instrument is the eigenfunction expansion of the operator at the boundary, now we use the Browder–Garding generalized expansion to see that any solution of the boundary value problems extends to a solution of the operator on the cylinder.

1. Use the Browder–Gårding expansion as in the proof of the finiteness of the projection on the kernel 5.1. For a single leaf, the isomorphism
$$L^2(\partial L^0_x \times (-1,0]) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} L^2(\mathbb{R},\mu_j)\otimes L^2((-1,0])$$
represents a solution of the boundary value problem as $h_j(r,\lambda)=\chi_{(-\infty,0)}(\lambda)e^{-\lambda r}h_{j0}(r)$ hence the solution can be extended to the cylinder of the leaf $\partial L^0_x\times(0,\infty)$. This clearly gives a field of linear isomorphisms $T_x : \operatorname{Ker}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}_0^+}) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+_x)$ for $x\in X_0$, first extend T_x to all $L^2(L^0_x;E)$ to be zero on $\operatorname{Ker}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+})^\perp$ then let x take values also in X according to the method explained before i.e. put $T_x := T_{p(x)}$ for x in the cylinder. Take the polar decomposition $T_x = u_x|T_x|$, then u_x is a partial isometry with initial space $\operatorname{Ker}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}_0^+})$ and range $\operatorname{Ker}(D^+_x)$, i.e
$$u^*_x u_x = \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}(D_x^{\mathcal{F}_0^+}),\quad u_x u^*_x = \operatorname{Pr}\operatorname{Ker}(D^+_x).$$
We have to look at this relation into the Von Neumann algebra of the foliation on X. Split every L^2 space of the leaves as $L^2(L^0_{p(x)};E)\oplus L^2(\partial L^0_{p(x)}\times(0,\infty);E)$. With respect to the splitting, forgetting the indexes x downstairs, we have $u=\begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & 0\\ u_{21} & 0\end{pmatrix}$ acting on the field of $L^2(X;E)$ spaces of the leaves. Then $u^*=\begin{pmatrix} u^*_{11} & u^*_{21}\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}$ with conditions $u_{11}u^*_{21}=0$ and $u_{21}u^*_{11}=0$. Finally
$$uu^*=\begin{pmatrix} u_{11}u^*_{11}+u_{21}u^*_{21} & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \operatorname{Pr}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+}) & 0\\ 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}=\imath\operatorname{Pr}(D^{\mathcal{F}_0^+})$$
and similarly $u^*u=\operatorname{Pr}(D^+)$.

2. It is very similar to statement 1. in fact writing the Browder–Gårding expansion and imposing the adjoint boundary condition one ends directly into the space of extended solutions.

□

To conclude now we can compare Ramachandran index with our index; let's compare formula (85) with (81) keeping in mind that, the index of Ramachandran is now our extended index (see section 3)
$$\operatorname{ind}_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_0})=\operatorname{ind}_{\Lambda,L^2}(D^+)=\dim_\Lambda\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)-\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^-)$$
to obtain the equation
$$\dim_\Lambda\operatorname{Ext}(D^-)-\dim_\Lambda\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^-)=(h^-_\Lambda-h^+_\Lambda)/2+h/2.$$
The same argument applied to the (formal) adjoint of D^+ leads to the equation
$$\dim_\Lambda\operatorname{Ext}(D^+)-\dim_\Lambda\operatorname{Ker}_{L^2}(D^+)=(h^+_\Lambda-h^-_\Lambda)/2+h/2,$$
then
$$h=h^+_\Lambda+h^-_\Lambda$$
as in A.P.S.

10 The signature of a foliated manifold with boundary

In this section we apply our index formula to the signature operator. First we recount the story of the signature operator and its relation with the signature of a closed manifold and a with a compact manifold with boundary as in A.P.S; then following the paper of Luck and Schick [60] about L^2 signatures of Γ–coverings of manifolds with boundary we propose three different definitions of the signature for the foliation with boundary

Analytical (index theory)

Topological (de Rham)

Harmonic (Hodge)

and prove they all agree.

10.1 The Hirzebruch formula

The reference for the notation about the signature operator is the book bt Berline Getzler and Vergne [10]. Let X be an oriented Riemannian manifold and $|dvol|$ the volume the unique volume form compatible with the metric i.e. the one assuming the value 1 on each positive oriented orthonormal frame. In other words $|\,\mathrm{dvol} = |\sqrt{g}dx|$. One can define the Hodge $*$ operator in the usual way

$$*e^{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e^{i_k} = \mathrm{sign}(\sigma) e_{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{n-k}}$$

where $(e_1, ..., e_n)$ is an oriented orthonormal basis, $(i_1, ..., i_k)$ and $(j_i, ..., j_k)$ are complementary multindices and σ is the permutation $\sigma := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & . & . & . & . & n \\ i_1 & . & i_k & j_1 & . & j_{n-k} \end{pmatrix}$.
Since $*^2 = (-1)^{|\cdot|(n-|\cdot|)}$ this is an involution on even dimensional manifolds.
The bundle ΛT^*X of exterior algebras of X is a natural Clifford module under the action defined by

$$c(e^i) := \epsilon(e_i) - \iota(e^i) \tag{87}$$

where $\epsilon(e^i)\omega = e^i \wedge \omega$ is the exterior multiplication by e^i and $\iota(e_i)$ is the contraction by the tangent vector e_i. In other words it is the metric adjoint of exterior multiplication, $\epsilon(e^i)^* = \iota(e_i)$. The chirality involution

$$\tau := i^{[(n+1)/2]} c(e_1) \cdots c(e_n)$$

is related to the Hodge duality operator by

$$\tau = i^{[(n+1)/2]} * (-1)^{n|\cdot| + \frac{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)}{2}},$$

following from the identity (same deegree forms)

$$\int_X \alpha \wedge \tau\beta = (-1)^{n|\cdot|+|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} i^{[2n+1]/2} \int_X (\alpha, \beta)|dx|$$

while $\int_X \alpha \wedge *\beta = \int_X (\alpha, \beta)|dx|$. As a consequence one can write the adjoint of d in two different ways,

$$d^* = - * d * (-1)^{n|\cdot|+n} = -(-1)^n \tau d \tau.$$

Sections of the positive and negative eigenbundles of τ are called the self–dual and anti self–dual differential forms respectively and denoted by $\Omega^{\pm}(X)$.

Now suppose n is even, and X is compact. The bilinear form on the middle cohomolgy $H^{n/2}(X;\mathbb{R})$ defined by $(\alpha,\beta)\longmapsto\int_X\alpha\wedge\beta$ satisfies the identity

$$\int_X \alpha\wedge\beta=(-1)^{n/2}\int_X\beta\wedge\alpha.$$

In particular if n is divisible by four this is symmetric and has a signature $\sigma(X)$ i.e. the number $p-q$ related to the representation

$$Q(x)=x_1^2+\cdots+x_p^2-x_{p+1}^2-\cdots-x_q^2$$

of the associated quadratic form (this is independent by the choosen basis). In this situation the chiral Dirac operator $d+d^*$ acting on the space of differential forms is called the Signature operator[21]

$$(d+d^*)=D^{\mathrm{sign}}=\begin{pmatrix}0 & D^{\mathrm{sign},-}\\ D^{\mathrm{sign},+} & 0\end{pmatrix}:\Omega^+(X)\oplus\Omega^-(X)\longrightarrow\Omega^+(X)\oplus\Omega^-(X)$$

The Atiyah–Singer index theorem in this case becomes the Hirzebruch signature theorem

$$\mathrm{ind}(D^{\mathrm{sign},+})=\sigma(X)=\int_X\mathrm{L}(X)$$

where $\mathrm{L}(X)$ is the L–genus, $\mathrm{L}(X)=(\pi i)^{-n/2}\det^{1/2}\Big(\dfrac{R}{\tanh(\mathrm{R}/2)}\Big)$ for the Riemannian curvature R. The proof uses the Hodge theorem stating a natural isomorphism between the space of harmonic forms $\mathcal{H}^q(X)$ i.e. the kernel of the forms laplacian $\Delta=(d+d^*)^2$ and the cohomology $H^q(X)$ together with Poincaré duality.

Now on a manifold with boundary with product structure near the bounday the situation is much more complicated. The signature formula is the most important application of the index theorem in the A.P.S. paper. The operator can be written on a collar around the boundary as

$$D^{\mathrm{sign},+}=\sigma(\partial_u+B)$$

where the isomorphism $\sigma:\Omega(\partial X)\longrightarrow\Omega^+(X)$ and B is the self–adjoint operator on $\Omega(\partial X)$ defined by

$$B\alpha=(-1)^{k+p+1}(*_\partial d-d*_\partial)\alpha$$

where from here to the end $\dim(X)=4k$, $\epsilon(\alpha)=\pm1$ according to α is even or odd degree and $*_\partial$ is the Hodge duality operator on ∂X. Since B commutes with $\alpha\longmapsto(-1)^{|\alpha|}*_\partial\alpha$ and preserves the parity of forms, $B=B^{\mathrm{ev}}\oplus B^{\mathrm{odd}}$ and the dimension of the kernel at the boundary as the η invariant are twice that of B^{ev}. The A.P.S index theorem says

$$\mathrm{ind}(D^{\mathrm{sign},+})=h^+-h^--h^-_\infty=\int_X L-h(B^{\mathrm{ev}})-\eta(B^{\mathrm{ev}})$$

or

$$\mathrm{ind}_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},+})-h^-_\infty=\int_X L-h(B^{\mathrm{ev}})-\eta(B^{\mathrm{ev}})$$

where $h^\pm$ are the dimensions of the L^2–harmonic forms on the manifold $\hat{X}$ with a cylinder attached and h^-_∞ is the dimension of the limiting values of extended L^2 harmonic forms in $\Omega^-(X)$.

The identifications of all these numbers with topological quantities require some work.

---

[21] it differs from the Gauss–Bonnet operator $d+d^*$ only for the choice of the involution

1. The space $\mathcal{H}(\hat{X})$ of L^2 harmonic forms on the manifold with a cylinder attached $\hat{X}$ is naturally isomorphic to the image $\hat{H}(X)$ of
$$H_0^*(\hat{X}) \longrightarrow H^*(\hat{X}).$$
Equivalently one can use the relative de Rham cohomology $H^*(X, \partial X) \longrightarrow H^*(X)$ defined imposing boundary conditions $\omega_{|\partial X} = 0$ on the de Rham complex. This statement plays in the ∂–case the role played by Hodge theory.

2. The signature $\sigma(X)$ of a manifold with boundary is defined to be the signature of the non–degenerate quadratic form on the middle–cohomology $\hat{H}^{2k}(X)$. This is induced by the degenerate quadratic form given by the cup–product on the relative cohomology $H^{2k}(X, \partial X)$. By Lefshetz duality the radical of this quadratic form is exactly the kernel of the mapping $H^{2k}(X, \partial X) \longrightarrow H^{2k}(X)$ then
$$\sigma(X) = h^+ - h^- = \operatorname{ind}_{L^2}(A).$$

3. Then A.P.S get rid of the third number h_∞^- proving that $h_\infty^- = h_\infty^+ = h(B^{\mathrm{ev}})$ that together with $h_\infty^+ + h_\infty^- = 2h(B^{\mathrm{ev}})$ gives the final signature formula
$$\sigma(X) = \int_X L - \eta(B^{\mathrm{ev}}).$$

10.2 Computations with the leafwise signature operator

So let X_0 be a compact manifold with boundary equipped with an oriented $4k$–dimensional foliation transverse to the boundary and every geometric structure of product type near the boundary. As usual attach an infinite cylinder $Z_0 = \partial X_0 \times [0, \infty)_r$ and extend everything. The leafwise signature operator corresponds to the leafwise Clifford action (87) on the leafwise exterior bundle $\Lambda T^*\mathcal{F}$. If $(e_1, ..., e_{4k-1}, \partial_r)$ is a leafwise positive orthonormal frame near the boundary, the leafwise chirality element [22] satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\tau := i^{2k} c(e^1) \cdots c(e^{4k-1}) c(dr) &= i^{2k} * (-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \\ &= -i^{2k} c(dr) c_\partial = -i^{2k} c(dr) *_\partial (-1)^{|\cdot|+|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2}\end{aligned}$$

where $*$ is leafwise Hodge duality operator, $c_\partial = c(e^1) \cdots c(e^{4k-1})$ is, a part for the i^{2k} factor the leafwise boundary chirality operator and $*_\partial$ is the leafwise boundary Hodge operator. On the cylinder the leafwise bundle $\Lambda T^*\mathcal{F}$ is isomorphic to the pulled back bundle $\rho^*(\wedge T^*\mathcal{F}_{\partial X_0})$ (the projection on the base ρ will be omitted throughout) while separating the dr component on leafwise forms $\alpha = \omega + \beta \wedge dr$ yields an isomorphism

$$(\Lambda T^*\mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0} \longrightarrow (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}), \tag{88}$$

sometimes we shall write $(\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \wedge dr$ for the second addendum in (88) to remember this isomorphism. An easy computation involving rules as

$$d\omega = d_\partial\omega + (-1)^{|\omega|}\partial_r\omega \wedge dr$$

for $\omega \in C^\infty([0, \infty); \Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F})$ and $c(dr)(\omega + \alpha \wedge dr) = (-1)^{|\omega|}\omega \wedge dr - (-1)^{|\alpha|}\alpha$ shows that the operator can be written on the direct sum $(\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \oplus (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F})$ as the matrix

$$D^{\mathrm{sign}} = \begin{pmatrix} d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial & -(-1)^{|\cdot|}\partial_r \\ (-1)^{|\cdot|}\partial_r & c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial \end{pmatrix} = c(dr)\partial_r + (d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial) \oplus (d_\partial + c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial) \tag{89}$$

---

[22] we omit simbols denoting leafwise action for ease of reading

and

$$\tau = i^{2k} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & c_\partial(-1)^{|\cdot|} \\ -c_\partial(-1)^{|\cdot|} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{90}$$

Since $d^*_\partial = \tau_\partial d_\partial \tau_\partial = c_\partial d_\partial c_\partial$ formula (89) is equivalent to

$$D^{\mathrm{sign}} = c(dr)\partial_r + (d_\partial + d^*_\partial) \oplus (d_\partial + d^*_\partial).$$

There's also another important formula corresponding to the fact that $d + d^*$ anticommutes with τ. Denote $\Omega^\pm(\mathcal{F})$ the positive (negative) eigenbundles i.e. the bundles of leafwise auto–dual (anti auto–dual) forms. We can write the operator on the cylinder as an operator on sections of the direct sum $\rho^*(\Omega^+(\mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0} \oplus \Omega^+(\mathcal{F})_{\partial X_0})$ as the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -(-1)^{|\cdot|}\partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k}(-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} \\ (-1)^{|\cdot|}\partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k}(-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= c(dr)\partial_r + (*_\partial d_\partial - d_\partial *_\partial) i^{2k}(-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2}\Omega. \tag{91}$$

To pass from one representation to another we have to consider the following compositions

$$\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{i_1} (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \bigoplus (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \wedge dr \xrightarrow{1+\tau} \Omega^+(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{d+d^*} \Omega^-(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Pr}_2} \Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F} \ .$$

and

$$\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F} \xrightarrow{i_2} \Lambda(T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \bigoplus (\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}) \wedge dr \xrightarrow{1-\tau} \Omega^-(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{d+d^*} \Omega^+(\mathcal{F}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Pr}_1} \Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F}.$$

where i_j is the inclusion on the j–th factor and Pr_j is the corresponding projection.

10.3 The Analytic signature

The first definition we give is simple. It is merely the L^2 index of the signature operator on the foliated manifold with a cylinder attached.

Definition 10.64 — The Λ–analytic signature of the foliated manifold with boundary X_0 is the measured L^2 index of the signature operator on the foliated manifold with a cylinder attached,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) := \mathrm{ind}_{L^2,\Lambda}(D^{\mathrm{sign},+}).$$

Now, by the standard identification of the Atiyah–Singer integrand for the signature operator [10], formula (81) becomes

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \langle L(X), [C_\Lambda] \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial}) - h^+_\Lambda + h^-_\Lambda]$$

where $L(X)$ is the tangential L–characteristic class and the numbers $h^\pm_\Lambda$ and the foliation eta–invariant are referred to the boundary signature operator.
As in [5] first we have to identify these numbers. Minor modifications of the proof of Vaillant [93] are needed in order to prove the following.

Proposition 10.65 — For the foliated signature operator

$$h^+_\Lambda = h^-_\Lambda. \tag{92}$$

Consequently the formula for the analytical signature is

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\,\mathrm{an}}(X_0,\partial X_0)=\langle L(X),[C_\Lambda]\rangle+1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})].$$

PROOF— Use the representation (89) of the operator on the cylinder on the bundle $(\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F})\oplus(\Lambda T^*\partial\mathcal{F})$, here we can easily write the one parameter perturbation

$$D^{sign}_\epsilon=c(dr)\partial_r+(d_\partial+d^*_\partial)\oplus(d_\partial+d^*_\partial)-\dot{\theta}\Pi_\epsilon[(d_\partial+d^*_\partial)\oplus(d_\partial+d^*_\partial)]$$

where Π_ϵ the spectral projection $\Pi_\epsilon=\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}((d_\partial+d^*_\partial)\oplus(d_\partial+d^*_\partial))$ of the leafwise boundary (signature) operator and θ is the function considered above in (33). For clarity we make the position

$$d_\partial+d^*_\partial=D^{\mathrm{sign}}_\partial=\mathrm{S}_\partial$$

for the boundary signature operator. Now pass to the antidiagonal form

$$c(dr)\partial_r+(*_\partial d_\partial-d_\partial *_\partial)i^{2k}(-1)^{|\cdot|(|\cdot|-1)/2}\Omega. \tag{93}$$

It is a well known fact that only the middle dimension forms contribute to the index in fact the leafwise kernel of the signature operator is the space of leafwise harmonic forms and decompose

$$\ker\Delta_x=\oplus_{i=0}^p\ker\Delta_x^{(i)}$$

where $\Delta_x^{(i)}:\Omega^i(L_x)\longrightarrow\Omega^i(L_x)$. The subspace $\ker\Delta_x^{(r)}\oplus\Delta_x^{(n-r)}$ is τ–invariant for each $0\leq r\leq n$ and there is a field of unitary equivalences

$$[\ker\Delta_x^{(r)}\oplus\Delta_x^{(n-r)}]^+\longrightarrow[\ker\Delta_x^{(r)}\oplus\Delta_x^{(n-r)}]^-$$

given by $\omega+\tau\omega\longmapsto\omega-\tau\omega$. Now choose a leaf and apply the Browder–Gårding expansion exactly as in section 5 to the boundary operator in (93). We forget the subscript indicating we are on a single leaf and the isomorphisms coming from the eigenfunction expansion. A section $\xi\in\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})$ can be written on the cylinder $r\geq 3$,

$$\xi^\pm(\lambda,r)=\zeta^\pm(\lambda,i)[\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda)+(1-\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda))e^{\mp\lambda r}]$$

with the fundamental fact that the boundary datas $\zeta^\pm(\lambda,i)\in L^2(\pm[0,\infty)\times\mathbb{N},\mu)$ are univocally determined by $r=0$. Now there's a coefficient that's constant in r. It is precisely $\zeta^\pm(\lambda,i)\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda)$ and can be seen (under the spectral isomorphism) to belong to the image of the spectral projection $\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial\oplus\mathrm{S}_\partial)$. This subspace of $L^2(\partial L_x;\Lambda T^*\partial L_x)$ is naturally $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graded in fact the chirality operator τ commutes with the boundary operator.

In particular

$$\zeta^\pm(\lambda,i)\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda)\in[\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial\oplus\mathrm{S}_\partial)L^2]^\pm$$

The splitting becomes more evident looking at the decomposition (89)

$$\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial\oplus\mathrm{S}_\partial)=\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial)\oplus\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial)$$

with τ acting on the right–hand side according to

$$\tau=\begin{pmatrix}0 & -\tau_\partial(-1)^{|\cdot|}\\ \tau_\partial(-1)^{|\cdot|} & 0\end{pmatrix},$$

exactly formula (90). So we have defined a measurable family of maps

$$\mathcal{J}^\pm_x:\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})\longrightarrow[\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial)L^2\oplus\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_\partial)L^2]^\pm,\quad \xi^\pm\longmapsto\zeta^\pm(\lambda,i)\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda).$$

Now proposition 5.43 says that if we choose δ small, say $0<\delta<\epsilon$ then $\mathrm{Ker}_{e^{-\delta\theta}L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})$ is closed in each $e^{-\delta\theta}L^2$ and $\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})$ is closed into each $e^{\delta\theta}L^2$. It follows that

- We have a Borel family of continuous and middle–exact sequences

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}), \|\cdot\|_{e^{-\delta\theta}L^2}) &\longrightarrow (\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}), \|\cdot\|_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}) \\ &\longrightarrow [\chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}\partial)L^2 \oplus \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}\partial)L^2]^\pm\end{aligned} \tag{94}$$

  where the last arrow is $\mathcal{J}^\pm_x$.

- $h^\pm_{\Lambda,\epsilon} = \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{range}(J^\pm))$.

Now join togheter $\mathcal{J}_x := \mathcal{J}^+_x + \mathcal{J}^-_x$ assume that

$$\mathrm{range}(\mathcal{J}_x) \subset \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}\partial)L^2_x \oplus \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}\partial)L^2_x$$

splits into a direct sum

$$\mathrm{range}(\mathcal{J}_x) = \mathcal{V}_x \oplus \mathcal{W}_x. \tag{95}$$

Then in this case the proof ends because the chirality element acts on range($\mathcal{J}_x$) sending $\mathcal{V}_x$ into $\mathcal{W}_x$ and vice–versa then the ± eigenspaces must be isomorphic. □

So it remains to prove (95). First we need a lemma,

Lemma 10.66 — If $0 < \delta < \epsilon$ The family of spaces $\mathrm{range}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_\epsilon)$ is Λ–closed this property meaning that for every $\gamma > 0$ there exists a Borel family of closed subspaces $M \subset \mathrm{range}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_\epsilon)$ such that

$$\dim_\Lambda \overline{\mathrm{range}(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_\epsilon)}^{e^{\delta\theta}L^2} - \dim_\Lambda(M) < \gamma.$$

Proof — The first is a direct consequence of the Λ–Fredholm of the perturbed operator $D^{\mathrm{sign}_\epsilon}$ on the field $e^{\delta\theta}L^2$ in fact the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
e^{\delta\theta}L^2 \arrow[r, "D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_\epsilon"] & e^{\delta\theta}L^2 \\
L^2 \arrow[u, "e^{\delta\theta}"] \arrow[r, "D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_\epsilon+\delta\theta"] & D \arrow[u, "e^{\delta\theta}"]
\end{tikzcd} \tag{96}$$

and lemma 5.40 show that the operator on field of weighted spaces $e^{\delta\theta}L^2$ is Breuer–Fredholm than 0 is not contained in the Λ–essential spectrum of TT^* where $T = D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_\epsilon$ and T^* is the adjoint w.r.t the $e^{\delta\theta}$ norm and the spaces $M_\eta := \chi_{(-\infty,\eta)}(TT^*) \cup (\chi_{(\eta,+\infty)}(TT^*)$ are Λ–finite codimensional in the closure of the image of T in L^2 (L^2 because the vertical arrows in (96) are isomorphisms that preserve the Λ–dimension). □

Proposition 10.67 — For every x the image of $\mathcal{J}$ splits,

$$\mathrm{range}(\mathcal{J}_x) = \mathcal{V}_x \oplus \mathcal{W}_x.$$

Proof — Consider the first row of (94) i.e

$$(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}), \|\cdot\|_{e^{-\delta\theta}L^2}) \longrightarrow (\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}), \|\cdot\|_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2})$$

with the non–degenerate pairing $e^{-\delta\theta} \times e^{\delta\theta} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on each leaf,

$$(\mathrm{Ker}_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}), \|\cdot\|_{e^{-\delta\theta}L^2})^{\perp} = (\mathrm{Ker}_{e^{-\delta\theta}L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x}))^{\perp} = \overline{\mathrm{range}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})}^{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}$$

then extend $\mathcal{J}$ to be zero on the $e^{\delta\theta}$–hortocomplement of $\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})$ then

$$\mathrm{range}(\mathcal{J}_x) = \tilde{\mathcal{J}}_x\Big(\overline{\mathrm{range}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}_{\epsilon,x})}^{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}\Big).$$

Put $\mathrm{range}(\mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{K})$ by the continuity of $\mathcal{J}$ we can restrict our attention to elements in

$$\mathcal{K}^0_x := \mathrm{range}_{e^{\delta\theta}L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{\epsilon,x}) \cap \underbrace{\mathrm{Ext}(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{\epsilon,x})}_{e^{\delta\theta}-\mathrm{closed}}$$

for each x. So let $\xi \in \mathcal{K}^0$, by definition there exist $\alpha \in e^{\delta\theta}L^2(\Lambda T^*L_x)$ such that $\xi = D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{\epsilon}$ and $(D^{\mathrm{sign}}_{\epsilon})^2\xi = 0$. On the cylinder we can write $\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \wedge dr$ with $\alpha_i \in H^{\infty}(\partial L_x \times [0,\infty); \Lambda T^*L_x)$. Using again Browder–Gårding (or a spectral resulution, it's the same) of the boundary operator S_{∂} we can see that in the region $r \geq 3$ these section satisfy the differential equation

$$-(\partial_r)^2\alpha_l + (1 - \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\lambda))\lambda^2\alpha_l = 0$$

with solutions in the general form

$$\alpha_l(x,r) = r\beta_{l,1}(x) + \beta_{l,2} + O(e^{-\epsilon r})$$

and $\beta_{l,i} \in \chi_{(-\epsilon,\epsilon)}(\mathrm{S}_{\partial})$. Keeping in mind the identities $d + d^* = d_{\epsilon} + d^*_{\epsilon}$ with $d_{\epsilon} := d - d\theta\Pi_{\epsilon}$ and $d^*_{\epsilon} := d^* - d^*\theta\Pi_{\epsilon}$, using the identity $(1 - \Pi_{\epsilon})\beta_{0,j} = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\epsilon}\alpha_0(x,r) &= (\epsilon(dr)\partial_r + d(1-\Pi_{\epsilon}))(r\beta_{0,1}(x) + \beta_{(0,2)}(x) + O(e^{-\epsilon r}) \\ &= dr \wedge \beta_{0,1}(x) + O(e^{-\epsilon r}). \end{aligned}$$

The calculation to show that the second piece $d_{\epsilon}\alpha_1(x,r) \wedge dr = O(e^{-\epsilon r})$ can be performed in the same way.
For the second piece of the signature operator

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\epsilon}\alpha_1(x,r) \wedge dr = (-\iota(dr)\partial_r + d^*(1-\Pi_{\epsilon}))&(r\beta_{1,1} \wedge dr + \beta_{1,2}(x) + O(e^{-\epsilon r})) \\ &= -(-1)^{|\beta_{1,1}|}\beta_{1,1}(x) + O(e^{-\epsilon r}) \end{aligned}$$

with $d_{\epsilon}\alpha_0(x,r) = e^{-\epsilon r}$. This shows that

$$\mathcal{J}(\xi) = \mathcal{J}(d_{\epsilon}\alpha + d^*_{\epsilon}\alpha) = 0 \oplus (-1)^{|\beta_{0,1}|}\beta_{0,1} + (-1)^{|\beta_{1,1}|}\beta_{1,1}(x,r) \oplus 0$$

and concludes the proof. □

It remains to apply 10.66 to prove (92).

REMARK — Everythig works with coeficients on a rank m leafwise flat bundle, the signature formula in this case becames

$$\sigma_{\nu,\,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = m\langle L(X), [C_{\Lambda}]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_{\Lambda}(D^{\mathcal{F}_{\partial}})].$$

10.4 The Hodge signature

Consider the measurable field of Hilbert spaces of L^2–harmonic forms

$$x \longmapsto \mathcal{H}_x := \ker\{\Delta^q_x : L^2(\Lambda^q T^* L_x) \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^q T^* L_x)\}$$

where L_x is a leaf of the foliation on the manifold X with cylindrical ends. Since leafwise harmonic forms are closed this is a field of subspaces of the fields of de Rham cohomologies $H^*(L_x)$ hence inherits the structure of a measurable field of Hilbert spaces futhermore it makes sence to speak about the space of tangentially continuous sections $\mathcal{H}^q_\tau$.
So if the dimension of the foliation is $\underline{\dim(\mathcal{F}) = 4k}$ as above, we have a well defined bilinear form on the middle–degree leafwise transversally continuous (transversally measurable would be enough)

$$\mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda : \mathcal{H}^{2k}_\tau \times \mathcal{H}^{2k}_\tau \longrightarrow \mathbb{C},\ (\alpha, \beta) \longmapsto \int_X \alpha \wedge \beta d\Lambda = \int_X (\alpha, *\beta) d\Lambda. \tag{97}$$

given by the wedge product followed by integration against the transverse measure. This bilinear form is defined on forms (and there is simmetric) with real coefficients and extended to be sesquilinear ($\mathbb{C}$–antilinear in the second variable) on forms with complex coefficients in the usual way, $\mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda(\alpha, \beta \otimes \gamma) := \bar{\gamma}\, \mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda(\alpha, \beta \otimes \gamma)$. For sesquilinear forms to be simmetric means

$$\overline{\mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda(\alpha, \beta)} = \mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda(\beta, \alpha).$$

This field of bilinear forms corresponds, by Riesz Lemma to a continuous (measurable) field of self–adjoint bounded operators $A_x : \mathcal{H}^{2k}_{\tau,x} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}^{2k}_{\tau,x}$ univocally defined by the property

$$\mathrm{s}^\infty_\Lambda(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, A\beta)$$

where at the right–hand side the scalar product of the field of Hilbert spaces i.e., the L^2 scalar product on forms. Now A determines a field of orthogonal splittings $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{\tau,x} = V^+_x \oplus V^0_x \oplus V^-_x$ of Hilbert spaces where $V^\pm_x$ is the image of the spectral projection $\chi(0, \infty)(A_x)$ $(\chi(-\infty, 0)(A_x))$ and V^0_x is the kernel of A_x. The pairing on the leaf passing trough x is non degenerate if and only if $A^0_x = 0$ but we are interested in the general behaviour using the transverse measure to integrate.

Definition 10.68 — The signature on harmonic forms (The Hodge signature or the harmonic signature) on the foliated elongated manifold is

$$\sigma^\infty_\Lambda(X) := \dim_\Lambda V^+ - \dim_\Lambda V^-.$$

We shall use also the symbol $\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{Hodge}}(X, X_0)$ to refer to the compact pair, to denote the same number.

10.5 Analytical signature=Hodge signature

All the computations made in Proposition 10.65, Lemma 10.66 and Proposition 10.67 leads to the first equality promised.

Theorem 10.68 — The analytical signature of the compact manifold with boundary and the signature on harmonic forms on the manifold with cylinder attached do coincide,

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma^\infty_\Lambda(X) = \langle L(X), [C_\Lambda] \rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})]. \tag{98}$$

PROOF — The definition (97) says that $B = *_{|\Omega^{2k}}$ but since the dimension of the foliation is $4k$ we have $\tau_{|\Omega^{2k}} = *_{|\Omega^{2k}}$. It follows that

$$V^{\pm} = \ker_{L^2}(D^{\mathrm{sign},\pm}).$$

□

10.6 The L^2–de Rham signature

The goal of this section is to prepare the ground for the definition of the de Rham signature for the foliated manifold with boundary and the proof of its coincidence with the harmonic signature.

10.6.1 manifolds with boundary with bounded geometry

The generic leaf of $(X_0, \mathcal{F})$ is a Riemannian manifold with boundary with bounded geometry as those examined by Schick [85, 86, 87].

DEFINITION 10.69 — We say that a manifold with boundary equipped with a Riemannian metric has bounded geometry if the following holds

Normal collar : there exists $r_C > 0$ so that the geodesic collar

$$N := [0, r_C) \times \partial M : (t, x) \longmapsto \exp_x(t\nu_x)$$

is a diffeomorphism onto its image, where ν_x is the unit inward normal vector at $x \in \partial M$. Equip N with the induced metric. In the sequel N and its image will be identified. Denote $\mathrm{im}[0, r_C/3) \times \partial M$ by $N_{1/3}$ and similarly $N_{2/3}$.

Injectivity radius of ∂M : the injectivity radius of ∂M is positive, $r_{\mathrm{inj}}(\partial M) > 0$

Injectivity radius of M : there is $r_i > 0$ so that for $x \in M - N_{1/3}$ the exponential mapping is a diffeomorphism on $B(0, r_1) \subset T_xM$. In particular if we identify T_xM with $\mathbb{R}^m$ via an orthonormal frame we have Gaussian coordinates $\mathbb{R}^m \supset B(0, r_i) \longrightarrow M$ around any point in $M - N_{1/3}$

Curvature bounds : for every $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there is some $C_K > 0$ so that $|\nabla^i R| \leq C_K$ and $|\nabla^{\partial} l| \leq C_K$, $0 \leq i \leq K$. Here ∇ is the Levi–Civita connection on M, ∇^{∂} is the Levi–Civita connection on ∂M and l is the second fundamental form tensor with respect to ν.

Choose some $0 < r_1^C < r_{\mathrm{inj}}(\partial M)$, near points $x' \in \partial M$ on the boundary one can define **normal collar coordinates** by iteration of the exponential mapping of ∂M and that of M,

$$k_{x'} : \underbrace{B(0, r_i^C)}_{\subset \mathbb{R}^{m-1}} \times [0, r_C) \longrightarrow M, (v, t) \longmapsto \exp^M_{\exp^{\partial M}_{x'}(v)}(t\nu).$$

For points $x \in M - N_{1/3}$ standard **Gaussian coordinates** are defined via the exponential mapping. In the following we shall call both **normal coordinates**. It is a non trivial fact that the condition on curvature bounds in definition 10.69 can be substituted by uniform control of each derivative of the metric tensor g_{ij} and its inverse g^{ij} on normal coordinates. The definition extends to bounded geometry vector bundles on δ–manifolds with bounded geometry and each object of uniform analysis like i.e. uniformly bounded differential operators can be defined [87]. In particular, using a suitable partition of the unity adapted to normal coordinates one can define uniform Sobolev spaces (different coordinates give equivalent norms so we get hilbertable spaces) and every basic result continues to hold.

Proposition 10.70 — Let $E \longrightarrow M$ a bundle of bounded geometry over M. Suppose F is bounded vector bundle over ∂M. Then the following hold for the Sobolev spaces $H^s(E), H^t(F)$, $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ of sections.

1. $H^s(E), H^t(F)$ is an Hilbert space (inner product depending on the choices).

2. The usual (bounded) Sobolev embedding theorem holds with values on the Banach space $C_b^k(E)$ of all sections with the first k derivatives uniformly bounded,

$$H^s(E) \hookrightarrow C_b^k(E), \quad \text{whenever} \quad s > m/2 + k.$$

3. For the bundle of differential forms one can use as Sobolev norm the one coming from the integral of the norm of covariant differentials

$$\|\omega\|_k^2 := \sum_{i=0}^{k} \int_M \|\nabla^i \omega(x)\|^2_{T_x^* M \otimes \Lambda T^* M} |dx|.$$

4. For $s < t$ we have a bounded embedding with dense image $H^t(E) \subset H^s(E)$. The map is compact if and only if M is compact. We define

$$H^\infty(E) := \bigcap_s H^s(E), \quad H^{-\infty}(E) := \bigcup_s H^s(E).$$

5. Let $p : C^\infty(E) \longrightarrow C^\infty(F)$ a k–bounded boundary differential operator i.e the composition of an order k bounded differential operator on E with the morphism of restriction to the boundary. Then p extends to be a bounded operator

$$p : H^s(E) \longrightarrow H^{s-k-1/2}(F), \quad s > k + 1/2.$$

In particular we have the bounded restriction map $H^s(E) \longrightarrow H^{s-1/2}(E_{|\partial M}), s > 1/2$.

6. $H^s(E)$ and $H^{-s}(E)$ are dual to each other by extension of the pairing

$$(f, g) = \int_M g(f(x))|dx|;\ f \in C_0^\infty(E),\ g \in C_0^\infty(E^*)$$

where E^* is the dual bundle of E. If E is a bounded Hermitian or Riemannian bundle, then the norm on $L^2(E)$ defined by charts is equivalent to the usual L^2–norm

$$|f|^2 := \int_M (f, f)_x |dx|,\ f \in C_0^\infty(E).$$

Moreover $H^s(E)$ and $H^{-s}(E)$ are dual to each other by extension of $(f, g) = \int_M (f, g)_x |dx|$.

10.6.2 Random Hilbert complexes

Now we define the de Rham L^2 complexes along the leaves. These are particular examples of Hilbert complexes studied in complete generality in [18].
So let $x \in X_0$, consider the unbounded operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$d_{L^0_x} : \Omega^k_{d,x} = \{\omega \in C^\infty_0(\Lambda T^k L^0_x); \omega_{|\partial M} = 0\} \subset L^2_x(\Lambda T^k L^0_x) \longrightarrow L^2_x(\Lambda T^k L^0_x).$$

Being a differential operator it is closable, let $A^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)$ the domain of its closure i.e the set of L^2 limits ω of sequences ω_n such that also the $d\omega_n$ converges in L^2 to some $\eta =: d\omega$. The graph norm $\| \cdot \|^2_A := \| \cdot \|^2_{L^2} + \|d \cdot \|^2_{L^2}$ gives the graph the structure of an Hilbert space making d bounded. It is easily checked that $d(A^k_x) \subset \ker(d : A^{k+1}_x) \longrightarrow L^2_x)$ then we have a Hilbert cochain complex

$$\cdots \longrightarrow A^{k-1}_x \longrightarrow A^k_x \longrightarrow A^{k+1}_x \longrightarrow \cdots$$

with cycles $Z^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) := \ker(d : A^k_x \longrightarrow A^{k+1}_x)$ and boundaries $B^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) := \text{range}(d : A^{k-1}_x \longrightarrow A^k_x)$.

DEFINITION 10.71 — The L^2 (reduced)[23] relative de Rham cohomology of the leaf L^0_x is defined by the quotients

$$H^{k,x}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) := \frac{Z^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)}{\overline{B^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)}}.$$

Clearly the closure is taken in order to assure the quotient to be an Hilbert space. Similarly the L^2–de Rham cohomology of the whole leaf, $H^{k,x}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x)$ is defined using no (Dirichlet) boundary conditions. In particular $A^k_x(L^0_x)$ will be used to denote the domain of the closure of the differential as unbounded operator on $L^2(L^0_x)$ defined on compactly supported sections (the support possibly meeting the boundary). The subscript dR helps to make distinction with Sobolev spaces. Each one of this spaces is naturally isomorphic to a corresponding space of harmonic forms. More precisely

DEFINITION 10.72 — The space of k–L^2 harmonic forms which fulfill Dirichlet boundary conditions on ∂L^0_x is

$$\mathcal{H}^k_{(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) := \{\omega \in C^\infty \cap L^2,\ \omega_{|\partial L^0_x} = 0,\ (\delta\omega)_{|\partial L^0_x} = 0,\ \underbrace{(d\omega)_{|\partial L^0_x} = 0}_{\text{aut. satisfied}}\}$$

We shall see that the boundary conditions are exactly the square of the Dirichlet boundary condition on the Dirac operator $d + \delta$. Since each leaf is complete a generalization of an idea of Gromov shows that these forms are closed and co–closed, [85, 86]

$$\mathcal{H}^k_{(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) = \{\omega \in C^\infty \cap L^2(\Lambda^k L^0_x), d\omega = 0,\ \delta\omega = 0,\ \omega_{|\partial L^0_x} = 0\}.$$

Furthermore there's the L^2–orthogonal Hodge decomposition [85, 86]

$$L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L^0_x) = \mathcal{H}^k_{(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \oplus \overline{d^{k-1}\Omega^{k-1}_{d,x}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)}^{L^2} \oplus \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega^{k+1}_{\delta,x}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)}^{L^2}$$

---

[23] the word reduced stands for the fact we use the closure to make the quotient, also the non reduced cohomology can be defined. For a Γ covering of a compact manifold the examination of the difference reduced/unreduced cohomology leads to the definition of the Novikov–Shubin invariants [57]

where $\Omega^{k-1}_{d,x} := \{\omega \in C^\infty_0(\Lambda^{k-1}T^*L^0_x),\ \omega_{|\partial L^0_x} = 0\}$ and the corresponding one for δ with no boundary conditions $\Omega^{k+1}_{\delta,x} := \{\omega \in C^\infty_0(\Lambda^{k+1}T^*L^0_x)\}$. These decompositions shows with a little work that the inclusion $\mathcal{H}^k(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \hookrightarrow A^k_x$ induces isomorphism in cohomology (Hodge–de Rham Theorem)

$$\mathcal{H}^k(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \cong H^k_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x).$$

This is a consequence of the fact that the graph norm (of d) and the L^2 norm coincide on the space of cycles Z^k_x. Similar Hodge isomorphisms holds for the non–relative spaces and are well–known in literature.
As x varies in X_0 they form measurable fields of Hilbert spaces. We discuss this aspect in a slightly more general way applicable to other situations. Remember that a measurable structure on a field of Hilbert spaces over X_0 is given by a fundamental sequence of sections, $(s_x)_{x\in X_0}$, $s_n(x) \in H_x$ such that $x \longmapsto \|s_n(x)\|_{H_x}$ is measurable and $\{s(x)\}_n$ is total in H_x (see chapter IV in [89]).

Proposition 10.73 — If for a family of closed densely defined operators (P_x) with minimal domain $\mathcal{D}(P_x)$ a fundamental sequence $s_n(x) \in \mathcal{D}(P_x)$ is a core for P_x and $P_x s_n(x)$ is measurable for every x and n then the family P_x is measurable in the sense of closed unbounded operators (definition 4.24 and the remark below) i.e. the family of projections Π^g_x on the graph is measurable in the square field $H_x \oplus H_x$ with product measurable structure.

Proof— It is trivial in fact the graph is generated by vectors $(s_n(x), P_x s_n(x))$ then the projections is measurable. □

The lemma above can be applied to the $(A^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x))_x$ in fact in the appendix of [38] a fundamental sequence φ_n of sections with the property that each $(\varphi_n(\cdot))_{|L^0_x}$ is smooth and compactly supported is showen to exist. Now the same proof works for manifold with boundary and, since the boundary has zero measure one can certainly require to each φ_n to be zero on the boundary.

In particular we have defined complexes of square integrable representations. Reduction modulo Λ–a.e. gives complexes of random Hilbert spaces (with unbounded differentials) for which we introduce the following notations,

- $(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the field of Hilbert complexes

$$\cdots \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L^0_x) \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* L^0_x) \longrightarrow \cdots \qquad (99)$$

- $(H^{\bullet,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the reduced L^2 cohomology of (99)
- $(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces obtained by Λ a.e. reduction from the field of Hilbert complexes with Dirichlet boundary condition

$$\cdots \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L^0_x) \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Lambda^{k+1} T^* L^0_x) \longrightarrow \cdots \qquad (100)$$

  with differentials considered as unbounded operators with domains $A^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x)$.
- $(H^{\bullet,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0, \partial X_0), d)$ is the complex of Random Hilbert spaces of the cohomologies of the above complex.

10.6.3 Definition of the de Rham signature

Let $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = 4k$ Consider the measurable field of Hilbert spaces $A_x^k(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ of the minimal domains of the de Rham leafwise differential with Dirichlet boundary conditions $\omega_{|\partial L_x^0} = 0$ as above, with the graph Hilbert structure and the induce Borel structure. This square integrable representation of $\mathcal{R}_0$ carries a field of bounded symmetric sesquilinear forms defined by

$$s_x^0 : A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \times A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, (\omega, \eta) \longmapsto \int_{L_x^0} \omega \wedge \overline{\eta} = \int_{L_x^0} (\omega, *\eta) d\nu^x$$

i.e. the $\mathbb{C}$–antilinear in the second variable extension of the wedge product on forms , $\overline{\sigma \otimes \gamma} = \sigma \otimes \bar{\gamma}$ is the complex conjugate and ν^x is the Leafwise Riemannian metric. Note that also the scalar product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ on forms is extended to be sesquilinear.

LEMMA 10.74 — The sesquilinear form s_x^0 passes to the L^2 relative cohomology of the leaf $H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ factorizing through the image of the map $H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0)$ of the L^2 relative de Rham cohomology to the L^2 de Rham cohomology exactly as in the compact (one leaf) case.

PROOF— The first assertion is simply Stokes theorem, in fact let $\omega \in A_x^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0)$ i.e. $\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} \omega$, $d\omega_n \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$ and $\theta_m \in C_0^\infty(\Lambda T^{2k-1} L_x^0)$, $d\theta_m \xrightarrow{L^2} \varphi$ then

$$s_x^0(\omega, \varphi) = \lim_{n,m} \int_{L_x^0} \omega_n \wedge \overline{d\theta_m} = \lim_{n,m} \int_{L_x^0} d(\omega_n \wedge \overline{\theta_m}) = \lim_{n,m} \int_{\partial L_x^0} (\omega_n \wedge \theta_m)_{|\partial L_x^0} = 0.$$

The second one is clear and follows exactly from the classical case i.e. if $\beta_1 = \beta_2 + \lim_n d\rho_n$ with ρ_n compactly supported with no boundary conditions write

$$s_x^0([\alpha], [\beta]) = s_x^0([\alpha], [\beta_2]) + \lim_n \int \alpha \wedge \rho_n,$$

represent α as a L^2 limit of forms with Dirichlet boundary conditions than apply Stokes theorem again. □

For every x the sesquilinear form s_x^0 on the cohomology corresponds to a bounded selfadjoint operator $B_x \in B(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0))$ (a proof is in [77]) univocally determined by the condition $s_x^0(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha, B_x \beta)$. Measurability properties of $(s_x^0)_{x \in X_0}$ are by definition (for us) measurability properties of the family $(B_x)_x$. It is clear that everything varies in a Borel fashion (use again a smooth fundamental sequence of vector fields as in [38]) then the B_x's define a self–adjoint random operator $B \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(X_0, \partial X_0))$.

DEFINITION 10.75 — The Λ–L^2 de Rham signature of the foliated manifold X_0 with boundary ∂X_0 is

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) := \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda \, \chi_{(0,\infty)}(B) - \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda \, \chi_{(-\infty,0)}(B)$$

as random operators in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H_{dR,(2)}^{2k}(X_0, \partial X_0))$.

10.7 $\underline{L^2 \text{ de Rham signature}}$ $=$$\underline{\text{Harmonic signature}}$

This is a very long proof. We need some new tools. The path to follow is clearly the one in the paper of of Lück and Schick [58]. We shall show at the end of the section that we can reduce to the case in which **every leaf meets the boundary** or in other words **the boundary contains a complete transversal**.

10.7.1 The boundary foliation and $\mathcal{R}_0$

We have denoted by $\mathcal{F}_\partial$ the foliation induced on the boundary ∂X_0 i.e. the foliation where a leaf is a connected component of the intersection of a leaf L of $\mathcal{F}$ with the boundary. Let $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{F}_\partial)$ its equivalence relation with canonical inclusion $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0} \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_0$. We are under the assumption that the boundary contains a complete transversal T. This is also a complete transversal for $\mathcal{F}_\partial$, Call ν_T its characteristic function on $\mathcal{R}_0$. Then every transverse measure Λ for $\mathcal{R}_0$ is univocally determined by the measure Λ_{ν_T} supported on T. As a consequence (Theorem 4.3, page 20) one gets a transverse measure, continue to call Λ, on $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$. Let now (H, U) be a square integrable representation of $\mathcal{R}_0 \longrightarrow X_0$ and H its corresponding random Hilbert space, it pulls back to a square integrable representation (H', U') of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$. Also a random operator $A \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H)$ defines by restriction a random operator A' in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(H')$. We are going to show that

$$\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(A) = \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(A'). \tag{101}$$

This automatically proven if we think about the trace in terms of operator valued weight $\int \mathrm{tr}_{H_x}(\cdot) d\Lambda_\nu(x)$, of course we have to pay some care checking the domains of definitions of the two traces but from normality and square integrability the operators in form $\theta_\nu(\xi, \xi)$ as in the equation (16) furnish a sufficiently rich set to check the two. To see the problem under a slightly different point of view, first remember the trace is related to an integration of a Random variable. So suppose F is a Random variable on $\mathcal{R}_0$ (see the definition on section 4.1) the recipe Connes gives to integrate is the following: choose arbitrarily some faithful transverse function $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ then the integral is given by

$$\int F d\Lambda = \sup\Big\{\Lambda_\nu(\alpha(f)), f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X), \nu * f \leq 1\Big\}$$

where $X = \bigcup_{x \in X_0} F(x)$. The point (leading to the treatment in Moore and Schochet [65], for example) is that one can choose as ν the characteristic funtion ν_T of a complete transversal T. Then if $f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X)$ such that $\nu_T * f \leq 1$ also $\underline{f}$, the restriction of f on the space $X' = \bigcup_{t \in T} F(t)$ satisfies $\nu_t * f \leq 1$ and

$$\Lambda_T(\alpha(f)) = (\mu \circ \nu)(\alpha(f) = \int_T \nu^t \alpha^t(f) d\mu(t) = \Lambda_T(\alpha(\underline{f}))$$

(where ν and μ decompose Λ_{ν_T} on T 4.3, page 20) then

$$\sup\Big\{\Lambda_\nu(\alpha(f)) : \nu_T * f \leq 1,\ f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X)\Big\} \leq \sup\Big\{\Lambda_\nu(\alpha(f)) : \nu_T * f \leq 1,\ f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X')\Big\}.$$

The reverse inequality is simpler starting with a function $\underline{f} \in \mathcal{F}^+(X')$, $\nu * \underline{f} \leq 1$ and considering the function $f := \underline{f}$ on $\pi^{-1}(T)$ and 0 elsewhere. (π is the natural projection on the space X).

This simple argument allows ourselves to consider, as an instrument short sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \xrightarrow{i} A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) \xrightarrow{r} A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow 0$$

where $x \in \partial X_0$ as sequences of Random Hilbert spaces associated to $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$. In fact the third term seems not naturally defined without passing to the boundary relation. Formula (101) says that **traces of morphisms coming from the whole relation can be computed in the equivalence relation restricted to the boundary.** Now the third term of the sequence is directly related to the boundary. **Proper Functors** Again some words on the relation between $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{0|\partial X_0}$ or, better its restriction to the boundary $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$. We shall investigate how $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ sits inside $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ and the traces on algebras associated on it. Consider a class of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ i.e. a leaf of the boundary foliation; this is a connected component of a class of $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$. In other words each class of $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$ is a denumerable union of classes of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ i.e. the bigger one seems like to be some sort of denumerable union of the smaller under the obvious natural functor

$$\underline{\mathcal{R}_0} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}.$$

In the measure theory realm denumerability means that $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$ is not so bigger than $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$. Also if one makes use of a complete transversal for $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ to integrate natural[24] Random Hilbert spaces associated to $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$ this transversal touches denumerably times classes of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ so in definitive the geometric intuition says that *we are integrating (then taking traces) on the foliation induced on the boundary !* the notion of properness helps to understand this intuitive fact.

DEFINITION 10.76 —

- A measurable functor $F : \mathcal{G} \longrightarrow M$ with values standard measure spaces is called proper if w.r.t the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathcal{G} \arrow[r, "F"] \arrow[d, "r"] & X := \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{G}^{(0)}} \mathcal{G}^x \arrow[dl, "\pi"] \\
\mathcal{G}^{(0)} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

  $\mathcal{G}$ acts properly on X i.e. there exist a strictly positive function $f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X)$ and a proper $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ such that $\nu * f = 1$. Here we recall the defining formula

$$(\nu * f)(z) := \int_{\mathcal{G}^y} f(F(\gamma^{-1}) \cdot z) d\nu^y(\gamma).$$

- We say that a Borel groupoid $\mathcal{G}$ is proper if it acts properly on itself.

There is a proposition (Lemme 2 [26]) saying that properness is equivalent to each one of the following conditions

- There is one $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$, $f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X) : \nu * f = 1$.
- For every faithful $\nu \in \mathcal{E}^+$ there is some $f \in \mathcal{F}^+(X) : \nu * f = 1$.
- The kernel on X defined by $z \longmapsto \rho^z$, $\rho^z(f) := \int f(F(\gamma^{-1}) \cdot z) d\nu^y(\gamma)$ is proper for faithful ν.

Properness is a very strict condition, there's a big literature on the subject, one can consult for example the paper of Renault and Delaroche [29]. In some sense the existence of a strictly positive function f as in the definition provides an embedding of $X \longmapsto \mathcal{G}$ at level of L^∞ functions[25] in fact it defines the fibrewise map $q : \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}(X)$,

$$q(u)(p) := \int_{\mathcal{G}^{\pi(p)}} f(F(\gamma^{-1}) \cdot p)) u(\gamma) d\nu^{\pi(p)}(\gamma),$$

---

[24] i.e. given by $L^2 \bullet L$, where L is left traslation on $\mathcal{R}_0$

[25] for a good survey on non commutative integration theory and a physical application one can consult [53] where properness of Random variables is essential

with the essential unital property $q(1_{\mathcal{G}}) = 1_X$. The integration formula of a proper functor F against some transverse measure Λ becomes very simple

$$\int F d\Lambda = \Lambda_\nu(\alpha(f))$$

where ν and f are as in the definition. This is also related to the natural trace on the Von Neumann algebra of Endomorphisms. of the square integrable representation $L^2 \bullet F$. We recall that $L^2 \bullet F$ is nothing but the composition of the right translation functor with a measurable proper functor F. In fact, let $A \in \mathrm{End}_\Lambda(L^2 \bullet F)^+$ a positive intertwining operator and consider the new proper functor F_A associating to $x \in \mathcal{G}^0$ the measure space $F(x)$ and the measure, called local trace $\mu_x(g) := \mathrm{Trace}_{L^2(F(x),\alpha)}(A^{1/2} g A^{1/2})$ while an arrow $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}$ goes into the measure space isomorphism induced by left translation then Connes proves

$$\mathrm{Tr}_\Lambda(A) = \int F_A d\Lambda = \Lambda_\nu(\mu(f)) = \int_{\mathcal{G}^0} \mu_x(f) d\Lambda_\nu(x). \tag{102}$$

Remark — Almost by definition the measurable functor L left traslation given by $x \in \mathcal{G}^0 \longmapsto \mathcal{G}^x$ and $\gamma \longmapsto L_\gamma : \mathcal{G}^{s(\gamma)} \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{r(\gamma)}$ is proper.

We shall apply at once the remark above and the following proposition by Connes (Proposition 4. in [26]).

Proposition 10.77 — Let F, F' be two measurable functors with values measure spaces as in the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{G}^0} F'(x) = X' \arrow[dr, "\pi"'] & \mathcal{G} \arrow[l, "F'"'] \arrow[r, "F"] \arrow[d] & X = \bigcup_{x\in\mathcal{G}^0} F(x) \arrow[dl, "\pi"] \\
 & \mathcal{G}^0 & ,
\end{tikzcd}$$

suppose the existence of a measurable mapping associating to $z \in X$ a probability measure λ^z on X' supported on $F'(\pi(z))$ that's natural i.e. $\lambda^{\gamma \cdot z} = \gamma \lambda^z$, $\forall \gamma$, $\forall \gamma : s(\gamma) = \pi(z)$. Then

1. If F' is proper then F is proper
2. If F' is proper (then also F) then

$$\int \lambda^z d\alpha^x(z) = \alpha'^x, \forall z \Longrightarrow \int F d\Lambda = \int F' d\Lambda.$$

We shall apply this in the most simple way to some concrete situation of L^2. So let L' be the left multiplication functor $x \longmapsto (\mathcal{R}_0)^x_{|\partial X_0}$ while L is left traslation in $\mathcal{R}_0$. In symbols,

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\underline{\mathcal{R}_0} \arrow[r, "L'"] \arrow[d, "L'"] & X' = \bigcup_{x\in\partial X_0} (\mathcal{R}_0)^x_{|\partial X_0} . \\
X = \bigcup_{x\in\partial X_0} \mathcal{R}_0^x &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Both are proper because the first is the restriction of the multiplication of $\mathcal{R}_0$ the second is multiplication. Associate to L and L' some local trace of an intertwining operator B of a s.i. representation, say $x \longmapsto L^2(\partial L^0_x)$. We are saying that the target space $L'(x)$ is $(\mathcal{R}_0)^x_{|\partial X_0}$ and the measure is $f \longmapsto \alpha(f) = \mathrm{tr}(B^{1/2} f B^{1/2})$; the same association is done for L. Note that the integral $\int L' d\Lambda$ is exactly $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda(B)$ in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(L^2(\partial L^0_x))$. Now the Borel map associating to $z \in X$ a probability measure on X' in proposition 10.77 can be taken as the Dirac mass i.e.

$$z = (x,y) \longmapsto \lambda^z := \delta_{(x,y)}.$$

Naturality and measurability are obiouvsly verified. Let's check the integral condition, so take a function f in $(\mathcal{R}_0)^x_{\partial X_0} = \partial L^0_x$

$$\Big\langle \int \lambda(z) d\alpha^x(z), f \Big\rangle = \Big\langle \int \delta_{(x,y)} d\alpha^x((x,y)), f(x,y) \Big\rangle = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \mathrm{tr}_{L^2(C)}(f^{1/2}_{|C}\, B_x\, f^{1/2}_{|C})$$
$$= \mathrm{tr}_{L^2(\partial L^0_x)}(f^{1/2}\, B_x\, f^{1/2}) = \alpha'^x(f),$$

in fact while y runs trough $(\mathcal{R}^x_0) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{C}} C$ (connected components i.e classes of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$) the factor $\delta_{(x,y)}$ selects exactly the connected component it belongs to. Summarizing:

a Random operator associated to $(\mathcal{R}_0)_{|\partial X_0}$ restricts to a Random operator associated to $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ having the same trace.

10.7.2 Weakly exact sequences

Consider for $x \in \partial X_0$ the Borel field of cochain complexes

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & {} \arrow[d, "d"] & {} \arrow[d, "d"] & {} \arrow[d, "d"] & \\
0 \arrow[r] & A^{k-1}_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "d"] & A^{k-1}_x(L^0_x) \arrow[r, "r"] \arrow[d, "d"] & A^{k-1}_x(\partial L^0_x) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d"] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & A^k_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \arrow[r, "i"] \arrow[d, "d"] & A^k_x(L^0_x) \arrow[r, "r"] \arrow[d, "d"] & A^k_x(\partial L^0_x) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "d"] & 0 \\
 & {} & {} & {} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where each morphism must be considered as an unbounded operator on the corresponding L^2, i is bounded since is merely the restriction of the identity mapping on $L^2(L^0_x, \Lambda T^* L^0_x)$ and r is restriction to the boundary.

PROPOSITION 10.78 —

1. For every k the domain $A^k_x(L^0_x)$ is contained in the Sobolev space of forms $H^1(L^0_x, \Lambda T^* L^0_x)$. In particular the composition with r makes sense.
2. The rows are (weakly) exact i.e. one has to consider the closure of the images of i and r in the L^2 topology in the A^k_x's.

PROOF— 1. An element ω in $A^k_x(L^0_x)$ is an L^2–limit of smooth compactly supported forms ω_n with differential also convergent in L^2. Then since the Hodge $\star$ is an isometry on L^2 also $\delta\omega_n = \pm * \omega *$ converges. In particular we can control the L^2–norm of $d\omega$ and $\delta\omega$; this

means we have control of the first covariant derivative, in fact $d + \delta = c \circ \nabla$ where c is the (unitary) Clifford action. Then the second term can made less that the norm of ∇ by bounded geometry. In particular we have control on the order one Sobolev norm by proposition 10.70. The remaining part follows from the fact that the restriction morphism is bounded from H^1 to $H^{1/2} \hookrightarrow L^2$.
2. The only non–trivial point is exactness in the middle but as a consequence of the bounded geometry the boundary condition on the first space extends to H^1 (see proposition 5.4 in the thesis of Thomas Schick [85]) that together with point 1. is exactness. □

Remark — Note that the proof of the proposition above says also that the induced morphisms i_* and r_* are bounded.

Definition 10.79 — We introduce the notations $L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0)$ and $L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0)$ for the complexes of Random Hilbert spaces with unbounded differential introduced above.

Every arrow induces morphisms on the reduced L^2 cohomology. Miming the algebraic construction of the connecting morphism (everything works thanks to the remark above) we have, for every $x \in \partial X_0$ the long sequence of square integrable representations of the equivalence relation of the boundary foliation $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^{k,x}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \xrightarrow{i_*} H^{k,x}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x) \xrightarrow{\qquad r_* \qquad}$$

$$\xrightarrow{\qquad r_* \qquad} H^{k,x}_{dR,(2)}(\partial L^0_x) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^{k-1,x}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Remove the dependence on x to get a long sequence of Random Hilbert spaces over ∂X_0 with consistent notation with (99) and (100)

$$\cdots \longrightarrow H^{k}_{dR,(2)}(X_0, \partial X_0) \xrightarrow{i_*} H^{k}_{dR,(2)}(X_0) \xrightarrow{\qquad r_* \qquad} \tag{103}$$

$$\xrightarrow{\qquad r_* \qquad} H^{k}_{dR,(2)}(\partial X_0) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^{k-1}_{dR,(2)}(X_0, \partial X_0) \longrightarrow \cdots$$

Definition 10.80 — We say that a sequence of Random Hilbert spaces as (103) is Λ–weakly exact at some term if in the correspondig Von Neumann algebra of Endomorphisms the projection on the closure of the range of the incoming arrow coincide with the projection on the kernel of the starting one. These means i.e at point $\xrightarrow{i^*} H^k_{dR,(2)}(X_0) \xrightarrow{r^*}$,

$$\overline{\operatorname{range} i^*} = \ker i^* \in \operatorname{End}_\Lambda(H^k_{dR,(2)}(X_0)).$$

Of course such a sequence cannot be exact, just as in the case of Hilbert Γ–modules there are simple examples of non exacteness (see Example 1.19 in [57], or the example on manifolds with cylindrical ends in the paper of Cheeger and Gromov [22]). An necessary condition to weakly exactness is (left) fredholmness, as in [22].

10.7.3 Spectral density functions and Fredholm complexes.

Let U,V two Random Hilbert spaces on $\mathcal{R}_0$ (for these consideration also the holonomy groupoid or, more generally a Borel groupoid would work) and an unbounded Random operator $f : \mathcal{D}(f) \subset U \longrightarrow V$ i.e start with a Borel family of closed densely defined operators $f_x : U_x \longrightarrow V_x$ intertwining the representation of $\mathcal{R}_0$. Since f is closable, the question of measurability is addressed in definition 4.24. For every $\mu \geq 0$ put $\mathcal{L}(f,\mu)$ as the set of measurable fields of subspaces $L_x \subset \mathcal{D}(f_x) \subset U_x$ (measurability is measurability of the family of the closures) such that for every $x \in X_0$ and $\phi \in L_x$, $\|f_x(\phi)\| \leq \mu\|\phi\|$. After reduction modulo Λ a.e. this becomes a set of Random Pre–Hilbert spaces we call $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(f,\mu)$

Definition 10.81 — The Λ–spectral density function of the family $\{f_x\}_x$ is the monotone increasing function

$$\mu \longmapsto F_\Lambda(f,\mu) := \sup\{\dim_\Lambda : L \in \mathcal{L}_\Lambda(f,\mu)\}.$$

Here of course one has to pass to the closure in order to apply the Λ–dimension. We say f is Λ Fredholm if for some $\epsilon > 0$, $F_\Lambda(f,\epsilon) < \infty$

We want to show that this definition actually coincides with the definition given in term of the spectral measure of the positive self–adjoint operator f^*f.

Lemma 10.82 — In the situation above

$$F_\Lambda(f,\mu) = \mathrm{tr}_\Lambda\, \chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f) = \dim_\Lambda \mathrm{range}(\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f))$$

as a projection in $\mathrm{End}_\Lambda(U)$.
Notice that since f^*f is a positive operator $\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f) = \chi_{(-\infty,\mu^2]}(f^*f)$ is the spectral projection associated to the spectral resolution $f^*f = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \mu d\chi_{(-\infty,\mu]}$.

PROOF— The spectral Theorem (a parametrized measurable version) shows that the ranges of the family of projections $\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f)$ belong to the class $\mathcal{L}(f,\mu)$, then

$$\dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{range}(\chi_{[0,\mu^2)}(f^*f))) \leq F_\Lambda(f,\mu).$$

In fact it's clear that $\chi_{[0,\mu^2)}(f_x^*f_x)\omega = \omega \Rightarrow \|f\omega\| \leq \mu\|\omega\|$. But now for every $L \in \mathcal{L}(f,\mu)$ we get a family of injections $\chi_{\mu^2}(f_x^*f_x)_{|L_x} \longrightarrow \mathrm{range}(\chi_{\mu^2}(f_x^*f_x))$ that after reduction modulo Λ and with the crucial property of the formal dimension 3 in lemma 4.7 says

$$\dim_\Lambda(L) \leq \dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{range}(\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f)).$$

□

Definition 10.83 — A complex of random Hilbert cochains as $(L^2(\Omega^\bullet X_0), d)$ and its relative and boundary versions is said Λ–(left) Fredholm in degree k if the differential induced on the quotient

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}(d^k)}{\mathrm{range}(d^{k-1})} \xrightarrow{d} L^2(\Omega^{k+1}X_0)$$

gives by Λ a.e. reduction a left Fredholm unbounded operator in the sence of definition 10.81. In particular the condition involving the spectrum distribution function is

$$F_\Lambda\big(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \mathrm{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1}X_0), \mu\big) < \infty \tag{104}$$

for some positive number μ.
For this reason one calls the left hand–side of (104)

$$F_\Lambda\Big(L^2(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu\Big) := F_\Lambda\big(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \mathrm{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1}X_0), \mu\big)$$

the spectral density function of the complex at point k.

Remark — The definition above combined with lemma 10.82 says that we have to compute the formal dimension of $\chi_{[0,\mu^2]}(f^*f)$ where $f = d_{|\mathcal{D}(d)\cap\overline{\mathrm{range}(d^{k-1})}^\perp}$. But f is an injective restriction of d^k; then every spectral projection $\chi_B(f^*f)$ projects onto a subspace that's orthogonal to $\ker(d^k)$. This means

$$F_\Lambda\big(d| : \mathcal{D}(d^k) \cap \mathrm{range}(d^{k-1})^\perp \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{k+1}X_0), \mu\big) = \sup \mathcal{L}^\perp_\Lambda(f, \mu) \qquad (105)$$

where $\mathcal{L}^\perp_\Lambda(f,\mu)$ is the set of Random fields of subspaces of $\mathcal{D}(d)\cap\ker(d)^\perp$ where d is bounded by μ (see Definition 10.81)

Now return to the boundary foliation ∂F_0 with its equivalence relation $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$.

Theorem 10.83 — All the three complexes of Random Hilbert spaces

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0) \\
\underline{\mathcal{R}_0} \arrow[ur] \arrow[r] \arrow[dr] & L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet X_0, \partial X_0) \\
 & L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^\bullet \partial X_0)
\end{tikzcd}$$

with unbounded differentials are Λ–Fredholm.

Proof— The proof follows by an accurate inspection of the relation between the differentials (with or without boundary conditions) and the Laplace operator trough the theory of selfadjoint boundary differential problems developed in [85]. To make the notation lighter let $M = L^0_x$ with $\partial M = \partial L^0_x$ the generic leaf. We concentrate on the relative sequence at point $d : A^k(M, \partial M) \longrightarrow A^{k+1}(M, \partial M)$ where the differential is an unbounded operator on L^2 with Dirichlet boundary conditions. Let $\mathcal{D}(d) = A^{k+1}(M, \partial M)$. The following Lemma is inspired by Lemma 5.11 in [58] where in contrast Neumann boudary conditions are imposed.

Lemma 10.84 — Let $\ker(d)$ be the kernel of d as unbounded operator with Dirichlet boundary conditions, then

$$\mathcal{D}(d) \cap \ker(d)^\perp = H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1} C^\infty_0(\Lambda^{k+1}T^*M)}^{L^2}$$

where H^1_{Dir} is the space of order 1 Sobolev k–forms ω such that $\omega_{|\partial M} = 0$.

Proof— First of all remember that the differential operator $d + \delta : C^\infty(\Lambda^\bullet T^*M) \longrightarrow$

$C^\infty(\Lambda^\bullet T^*M)$ with either Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions is formally self–adjoint with respect to the greenian formula

$$(d^r\omega,\eta)-(\omega,\delta^{p+1}\eta)=\int_{\partial M}(\omega\wedge *^{p+1}\eta)_{|\eta}$$

and uniformly elliptic [85]. This means that this is an elliptic boundary value problem in the classical sense according to the definition of Lopatinski and Shapiro [69], Appendix I, together with a uniform condition on the local fundamental solutions. Now let $\omega\in C_0^\infty$ and $\eta\in\ker(d)$ i.e. $\eta_n\in C_0^\infty$, $(\eta_n)_{|\partial M}=0$, $\eta_n\xrightarrow{L^2}\eta$, $d\eta_n\xrightarrow{L^2}0$ then

$$(\eta,\delta\omega)=\lim_n(\eta_n,\delta\omega)=\underbrace{\lim_n(d\eta_n,\omega)}_{0}\pm\underbrace{\int_{\partial M}(\eta_n\wedge *\omega)_{|\partial M}}_{\eta_{|\partial M}=0}=0,$$

showing that $\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}\subset\mathcal{D}(d)\cap\ker(d)^\perp$. For the reverse inclusion take $\omega\in\mathcal{D}(d)\cap\ker(d)^\perp$ i.e. $\omega_n\in C_0^\infty$, $\omega_n\xrightarrow{L^2}\omega$, $d\omega_n\xrightarrow{L^2}0$. For fixed $\eta\in C_0^\infty$,

$$\underbrace{((d+\delta)\eta,\omega)}_{d\eta\in\ker(d),\omega\in\ker(d)^\perp}=(\delta\eta,\omega)=\lim_n(\delta\eta,\omega_n)\underbrace{=}_{\omega_{n\,|\partial M}=0}=\lim_n(\eta,d\omega).$$

Then we can apply the adjoint regularity theorem of Hörmander [85] Lemma 4.19, cor 4.22 saying that $\omega\in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$ then $(\delta\omega,\eta)=(\omega,d\eta)$ holds because for every $\eta\in C_0^\infty(M-\partial M)$, $d\eta\in\ker(d)$ then $\delta\omega=0$. It follows that for every $\sigma\in C_0^\infty$

$$0\underbrace{=}_{d\sigma\in\ker(d)}(d\sigma,\omega)=\underbrace{(\sigma,\delta\omega)}_{0}\pm\int_{\partial M}(\sigma\wedge *\omega)_{|\partial M}=\pm\int_{\partial M}(\overline{\omega}\wedge\overline{*\sigma})_{|\partial M}.$$

The last passage coming from the definition of the Hodge $*$ operator, $\sigma\wedge *\omega=(\sigma,\omega)dvol=(\overline{\omega},\overline{\sigma})dvol=\overline{\omega}\wedge\overline{*\sigma}$, where $\bar{\cdot}$ is the complex conjugate in $\Lambda T^*M\otimes\mathbb{C}$. Now from the density of $\{i^*(\overline{*\sigma})\}_{\sigma\in C_0^\infty}$ in $L^2(\partial M)$, $i:\partial M\hookrightarrow M$ the boundary condition $\omega_{|\partial M}=0$ follows in particular $\omega\in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}}$. Now it remains to apply the Hodge decomposition

$$L^2(\Lambda^kT^*M)=\mathcal{H}^k_{(2)}(M,\partial M)\oplus\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega^{k-1}_d(M,\partial M)}^{L^2}\oplus\overline{\delta^{k+1}\underbrace{\Omega^{k+1}_\delta(M,\partial M)}_{\text{no }\partial-\text{conditions}}}^{L^2}$$

to deduce $\omega\in\overline{\delta^{k+1}C_0^\infty(\Lambda^{k+1}T^*M)}^{L^2}$. □

Consider again the formally selfadjoint boundary value problem $d+\delta$ with Dirichlet boundary conditions i.e $\mathcal{D}(d+\delta)=H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}}$. Its square in the sense of unbounded operators on L^2 is the laplacian Δ with domain

$$H^2_{\mathrm{Dir}}:=\{\omega\in H^2:\omega_{|\partial M}=0,\ ((d+\delta)\omega)_{|\partial M}=(\delta\omega)_{|\partial M}=0\}.$$

Let $\Delta_k^\perp$ the operator obtained from Δ on k–forms restricted to the orthogonal complement of its kernel, it is easy to see that the splitting

$$L^2(\Lambda^kT^*M)=\mathcal{H}^k_{(2)}(M,\partial M)\oplus\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega^{k-1}_d(M,\partial M)}^{L^2}\oplus\overline{\delta^{k+1}\underbrace{\Omega^{k+1}_\delta(M,\partial M)}_{\text{no }\partial-\text{conditions}}}^{L^2}$$

induces the following splitting on Δ_k,

$$\Delta_k^{\perp} = (\delta^{k+1} d^p)_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}} \oplus (d^{k-1}\delta^k)_{|\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}}}.$$

Lemma 10.85 — The following identies of unbounded operators hold

$$\begin{aligned}(\delta^{k+1} d^p)_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}} &= (d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}})^*(d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}),\\ (d^{k-1}\delta^k)_{|\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}}} &= (d^{k-1}_{|\overline{\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}})(d^{k-1}_{|\overline{\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}})^*\end{aligned}$$

where the $d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}$ is the unbounded operator on the subspace $\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ of L^2 with domain $H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ and range $\overline{d^{k+1}\Omega_d^{k+1}}$.

Proof — This is again the *dual* (in the sense of boundary conditions) statement of Lemma 5.16 in [58]. We first state that the Hilbert space adjoint of the operator d^k with domain $H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}$ and range $\overline{d^{k+1}\Omega_d^{k+1}}$ is exactly δ^{k+1} with domain $H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{d^k\Omega_d^k}$. We shall omit degrees of forms and call d this restricted operator. Thanks to the intersection with H^1 this is also the restriction of $d+\delta$ to the same subspace, in particular $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d^*) \subset \overline{dC_0^\infty}$ implies $\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d)$ and $d\omega = 0$. Take arbitrary $\eta \in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty}$, then since $\delta\eta = 0$, $((d+\delta)\eta, \omega) = (d\eta, \omega) = (\eta, d^*\omega)$ and if $\eta \in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{d\Omega_d}$, $((d+\delta)\eta,\omega) = (\delta\eta,\omega) = 0$. Since $\delta H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \perp \overline{d\Omega_d}$ this is immediately checked,
$\sigma \in d\Omega_d$, $\sigma = d\lambda$, $\lambda_{|\partial M} = 0$, $(\sigma, \delta\gamma) = \underbrace{(d\sigma,\gamma)}_{=0} + \int_{|\partial M} \underbrace{(\sigma \wedge *\gamma)_{|\partial M}}_{=0}$.
Also $(\eta, d^*\omega) = 0$ since $d^*\omega \in \overline{\delta C_0^\infty}$ and $d\Omega_{\mathrm{Dir}} \perp \delta C_0^\infty$. Then we can apply again the adjoint regularity theorem [85], Lemma 4.19 to deduce $\omega \in H^1_{\mathrm{loc}}$. The next goal is to show $\omega \in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}}$ i.e. $d\omega, \delta\omega \in L^2$, $\omega_{|\partial M} = 0$ but $dx = 0 \in L^2$, $\delta\omega = (d+\delta)\omega = d^*\omega \in L^2$ and
$(\omega, d\delta\eta) = (d^*\omega, \delta\eta) = (\delta\omega, \delta\eta) = (\omega, d\delta\eta) \pm \overline{\int_{\partial M}(\delta\eta \wedge *\omega)_{|\partial M}}$ for every $\eta \in C_0^\infty$. Then $0 = \int_{\partial M}(\delta\eta \wedge *\omega)_{|\partial M} = \int_{\partial M}(\bar\omega \wedge \overline{*\delta\eta})_{|\partial M} \underbrace{=}_{=0} \int_{\partial M}(\omega \wedge *\delta\eta)_{|\partial M}$ for every η. The boundary condition follows by density. Finally it is clear that $\delta d_{|\mathcal{D}(d^*d)} = \Delta = \Delta^\perp$ but we have to prove the coincidence of the domains

$$\mathcal{D}(\Delta) \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty} = \mathcal{D}(d^*(d_{|\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}})),$$

now $\mathcal{D}(\Delta) = H^2_{\mathrm{Dir}} = \{\omega \in H^2,\ \omega_{|\partial M},\ (\delta\omega)_{|\partial M} = 0\} \subset \mathcal{D}(d^* d_{|\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}})$. Clearly

$$\omega \in \mathcal{D}(d^* d_{|\overline{\delta C_0^\infty}}) \Rightarrow \omega \in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}} \cap \overline{\delta C_0^\infty},$$

$d\omega \in H^1_{\mathrm{Dir}}$ then $(d+\delta)\omega \in H^1$ and since $\omega_{|\partial M} = 0$ by elliptic regularity (for the boundary value problem $(d+\delta)$ with Dirichlet conditions [85]) $\omega \in H^2$. We have just checked the boundary conditions, finally $\omega \in H^2_{\mathrm{Dir}} = \mathcal{D}(\Delta)$. The second equality in the statement is proven in a very similar way. □

Now that the relation of d with Dirichlet boundary condition restricted to the complement of its kernel with the Laplacian ($\Delta^\perp$) is clear we can use elliptic regularity to deduce that the relative Random Hilbert complex is Λ–Fredholm. This has to be done in two steps, the first is to show that the spectral function of the Laplacian controls the spectral function of the complex

$$F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) = F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) + F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^{k-1} X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) \tag{106}$$

in fact

$$\begin{aligned} F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) &= F_\Lambda\Big((\delta^{k+1}d^k)_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}), \sqrt{\mu}\Big) + F_\Lambda\Big((d^{k-1}\delta^k)_{|\overline{d^{k-1}\Omega_d^{k-1}}}), \sqrt{\mu}\Big) \\ &= F_\Lambda\Big((d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}})^*(d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}), \sqrt{\mu}\Big) + F_\Lambda\Big((d^{k-1}_{|\overline{\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}})(d^{k-1}_{|\overline{\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}})^*, \sqrt{\mu}\Big) \\ &= F_\Lambda\Big(d^k_{|\overline{\delta^{k+1}\Omega_\delta^{k+1}}}, \mu\Big) + F_\Lambda(d^{k-1}_{|\delta^k\Omega_\delta^k}, \mu\Big) \end{aligned}$$

where, in the first step we have used the obvious fact that the spectral functions behave additively under direct sum of operators togheter with the remark after (10.83) , at the second step there are lemmas 10.84 and 10.85 together with the following properties of the spectral functions

- $F_\Lambda\Big(f^*f, \sqrt{\lambda}\Big) = F_\Lambda(f, \lambda)$
- $F_\Lambda(\phi, \lambda) = F_\lambda(\phi^*, \lambda)$

that can be adapted to hold in our situation with unbounded operators. Good references are the paper of Lott and Lück [55] and the paper of Lück and Schick [58] that inspired completely this treatment.
Let us firs recall the equation

$$F_\Lambda(\Delta_k^\perp, \sqrt{\mu}) = F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^k X_0, \partial X_0), \mu) + F_\Lambda(L^{2,\mathcal{F}}(\Omega^{k-1} X_0, \partial X_0), \mu).$$

It says that we have only to show that $\Delta_k^\perp$ is left Λ–Fredholm to have control of both Fredholmness at degree k and $k-1$. We can use the heat kernel, in fact by elliptic regularity for each leaf the heat kernel $e^{-t\Delta_{k,x}^{\perp}}(z,z')$ is smooth and uniformly bounded along the leaf on intervals $[t_0, \infty)$ [85] Theorem 2.35. As x varies in ∂X_0 these bounds can made uniform by the uniform geometry (in fact the constants depend on the metric tensor, its inverse and a finite number of their derivatives in normal coordinates) and we get a family of smooth kernels that varies transversally in a measurable fashion since it is obtained by functional calculus from a measurable family of operators. Then they give a Λ–trace class element in the Von neumann algebra. Now the projections $\chi_{[0,\mu]}(f^*f)$ in definition 10.83 where f is the differential restricted to the complement of its kernel are obtained from the heat kernel as

$$\chi_{[0,\mu]}(f^*f) = \underbrace{\chi_{[0,\mu]}(\Delta_k^\perp)e^{\Delta_k^\perp}}_{\text{bounded}} \underbrace{\chi_{[0,\mu]}(\Delta_k^\perp)e^{-\Delta_k^\perp}}_{\Lambda-\text{trace class}} < \infty.$$

□

REMARK — The same argument of elliptic regularity for b.v. problems togheter with the various Hodge decompositions shows that each term of the long sequence (103) is a finite Random Hilbert space.

Theorem 10.85 — The long sequence (103)

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\cdots \arrow[r] & H^{k,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0,\partial X_0) \arrow[r, "i_*"] & H^{k,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0) \arrow[r, "r_*"] & {} \\
{} \arrow[r, "r_*"] & H^{k,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(\partial X_0) \arrow[r, "\delta"] & H^{k-1,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0,\partial X_0) \arrow[r] & \cdots
\end{tikzcd}$$

is Λ–weakly exact (definition 10.80)

Proof— This is exactly the same proof of Cheeger and Gromov [22]; we present it here, in the form appearing in the book by Lück (Theorem 1.21 in [57]). In fact the crucial final step there, that is based on the property of formal dimension of Hilbert Γ–modules

$$\dim_\Gamma\Big(\bigcap_{i\in I} V_i\Big) = \inf_{i\in I}\dim_\Gamma V_i,$$

is replaced here by proposition 4.9.
We prove only exactness in the middle i.e. at $H^k_{dR,(2)}(X_0)$. At each point $x\in\partial X_0$ we have $\overline{\mathrm{range}(i_{*,x})}\subset\ker(r_{*,x})$. So let U_x the (Borel) field of orthogonal complements in $\ker(r_{*,x})$, seen as a projection in the corresponding algebra, we have only to prove (the trace is faithful) $\mathrm{tr}_\Lambda U = 0$. Let V_x the family of closed subspaces corresponding to the various U_x under the baby L^2–Hodge–de Rham isomorphism or abstract Hodge is. (see Theorem 1.18 in [57])

$$\ker(d^k_x)\cap\ker(\gamma^k_x)\longrightarrow H^k_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x). \tag{107}$$

where γ^k is the Hilbert space adjoint of d^k. Note that this varies in measurable fashion since the is. is induced by inclusion. Let d^{k-1}_x the de Rham differential on the leaf $d^{k-1}_x : L^2(\Omega^{k-1}L^0_x)\longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^K L^0_x)$ then we have $r^k_x(V_x)\subset\overline{\mathrm{range}\, e^{k-1}_x}$ since $r_{*,x}(V_x)=0$. The operator $d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^* : L^2(\Omega^k L^0_x)\longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^k L^0_x)$ is positive so let $\{E_{\lambda,x}|\lambda\in\mathbb{R}\}$ its right continuous spectral family (to ensure measurability use a parametrized version of the spectral theorem for measurable fields of unbounded operators). Each projection $E_{\lambda,x}$ commutes with $d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^*$ then sends $\overline{\mathrm{range}[d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^*]}$ to itself. We have

$$\overline{d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^*} = \ker[d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^*]^\perp = [\ker[(d^{k-1}_x)^*]^\perp = \overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}_x},$$

the second following from $\langle d^{k-1}\circ(d^{k-1})^*)v,v\rangle = |(d^{k-1})^*v|^2$. From this chain of equalities follows

$$E_{\lambda,x}\circ r^k_x\subset\overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}_x}.$$

The next goal is to show that $E_{\lambda,x}\circ r^k_x$ is an injection on V_x for every $\lambda>0$. So pick a vector $v_x\in V_x : E_{\lambda,x}\circ r^k_x v_x = 0$ then $r^k_x v_x\in\mathrm{range}(E_{\lambda,x})^\perp$. But for every $\lambda>0$ the operator $d^{k-1}_x\circ(d^{k-1}_x)^*$ is invertible from $\mathrm{range}(E_{\lambda,x})^\perp$ to itself, the inverse given by the spectral function $\int_\lambda^t y\mu^{-1}dE_{\mu,x}$, in particular we can find $w_x\in L^2(\Omega^k L^0_x)$ such that $r^k_x v_x = d^{k-1}_x w_x$. A little diagram chasing shows there exist ξ_x $L^2(\Omega^{k-1}L^0_x) : r^k_x\xi_x = w_x$ and some $\sigma\in L^2(\Lambda^k T^* L^0_x,\partial L^0_x) : i^k_x\sigma = d^{k-1}_x\xi_x - v_x$. Then σ is closed and $[\sigma]\in H^k_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x,\partial L^0_x)$ is the class whose image under $i^k_{*,x}$ is the element in U_x corresponding to v_x. Since U_x is orthogonal to $\mathrm{range}(i_{*,x^k})$, $v_x=0$. Now we know $E_{\lambda,x}\circ r^k_x$ is an injection the following chain of equalities collect all the V_x to form the projection V at level of the Von Neumann algebra and, by left

Fredholmness, right continuity of the spectral family E_λ (leaf by leaf) and proposition 4.9

$$\begin{aligned}\dim_\Lambda(V) =&\dim_\Lambda(\overline{E_\lambda \circ r^k(V)})\\ =&\dim_\Lambda(\overline{E_\lambda \circ r^k(V)} \cap \overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}})\\ =&\lim_{\lambda\to 0} \dim_\Lambda(\overline{E_\lambda \circ r^k(V)} \cap \overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}})\\ =&\dim_\Lambda\Big(\bigcap_{\lambda>0} \mathrm{range}\, E_\lambda \cap \overline{(\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1})}\Big)\\ =&\dim_\Lambda(\mathrm{range}\, E_0 \cap \overline{(\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1})}\\ =&\dim_\Lambda(\ker(d^{k-1} \circ (d^{k-1})^*) \cap \overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}})\\ =&\dim_\Lambda(\ker(d^{k-1})^* \cap \mathrm{range}\,\overline{\mathrm{range}\, d^{k-1}}) = \dim_\Lambda 0 = 0\end{aligned}$$

□

10.7.4 The proof

THEOREM 10.85 — We have

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X, \partial X_0)$$

thus together with formula (98) w.r.t. the manifold with cylinder attached X all the three signatures we have defined agree

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_\Lambda^\infty(X) = \langle L(X), [C_\Lambda]\rangle + 1/2[\eta_\Lambda(D^{\mathcal{F}_\partial})]$$

PROOF— We pass through different intermediate results, sometimes doing leafwise considerations. Our model is of course the work of Lück and Schick [60] whose our work is only an adaptation. The proof of Lück and Schick in turn is inspired by the classical argument of Atiyah Patodi and Singer [5] with the great issue that at L^2 level long sequences are only weakly exact and the spectrum of the boundary operator is not discrete.

First step. This is done. We have proved, following the method of Vaillant the equality

$$\sigma_{\Lambda,\mathrm{an}}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_\Lambda^\infty(X)$$

where at right–hand side the signature on harmonic leafwise L^2–forms on the elonged manifold with elonged foliation i.e. the Λ signature of the Poincarè product on leafwise harmonic forms. Our reference is then the harmonic signature.

Second step. We shall prove $\sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0) = \sigma_\Lambda^\infty(X)$. We explain now the strategy

We have to measure the $+/-$ eigenspaces of the intersection form on the field of Hilbert spaces $H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(X_0, \partial X_0)$ as square integrable representations of $\mathcal{R}_0$ (the whole foliation on X_0). Now thanks to the fundamental note on section 10.7.1 it is sufficient to measure the corresponding projections in the von Neumann algebra arising by restriction of the Random Hilbert spaces to $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ (the equivalence relation of the foliation induced on the boundary). This is a consequence of the very definition of the trace as an integral of a functor with values measure spaces and the fact the boundary contains a complete transversal. The passage to $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ has the great vantage we can write boundary problems and sequences of random Hilbert spaces, in particular the third term in

$$0 \longrightarrow A^{k-1}_x(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \xrightarrow{i} A^{k-1}_x(L^0_x) \xrightarrow{r} A^{k-1}_x(\partial L^0_x) \longrightarrow 0$$

is natural as representations of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$.

Remember the notation $x \in \partial X_0$, L^0_x is the leaf of the compact foliated manifold with boundary, L_x is the leaf of the foliation on the manifold X with a cylinder attached. Consider the random Hilbert space $H^{2k}_{dr,(2)}(X_0)$ obtained from the various L^2 cohomologies of the leaves with no boundary conditions (this is called in [60] the L^2–homology since it naturally pairs with forms with Dirichlet boundary conditions). We have a family of restriction maps $\partial X_0 \ni x \longmapsto r^p_x : \mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x)$ and intertwining operators $(\mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x))_{x\in X_0} :\longmapsto H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x)$. There are also natural mappings $i^{2k}_x : H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \longrightarrow H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L_x)$. And the mapping q coming from the long sequence in cohomology as in the following diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \arrow[r, "i^{2k}_x"] & H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x) \arrow[d, "q^{2k}_x"] \\
\mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) \arrow[ur, "r^{2k}_x"] & H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(\partial L^0_x)
\end{tikzcd} . \tag{108}$$

Following the program of Lück and Schick we shall prove

1. $$\overline{\mathrm{range}(r^{2k})} = \overline{\mathrm{range}(i^{2k})} \text{ as projections in } \mathrm{End}_{\Lambda,\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}}\left[H^{2k,\mathcal{F}}_{dR,(2)}(X_0)\right] \tag{109}$$

   and the signature can be computed looking at the fields of sesquilinear Poincarè products on the images of i^{2k}_x as square integrable representations of $\mathcal{R}_0$,

   $$\begin{tikzcd}
   H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x, \partial L^0_x) \arrow[r, "i^{2k}_x"] & H^{2k}_{dR,(2)}(L^0_x) \\
   \mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) \arrow[ur, "r^{2k}_x"] &
   \end{tikzcd} . \tag{110}$$

2. The signature of the field of products on the image of i^{2k}_x concides with the signature of the fields of Poincaré products on $(\mathcal{H}_x)_{x\in X_0}$ as square integrable representations of $\underline{\mathcal{R}_0}$ that in turn coincides with those computed tracing in $\mathcal{R}_0$

Notice about (109) that $\overline{\mathrm{range}(i^{2k})} = \ker q^{2k}$ by the long exact sequence.

1. Lück and Schick (lemma 3.12 in [58]) prove the following result

LEMMA 10.86 —
$$q_x^{2k} \circ r_x^{2k} = 0,\ x \in \partial X_0$$

PROOF — We write the proof only for the sake of completeness. Look at the diagram (108) and choose an harmonic form $\omega \in \mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x)$ then by elliptic regularity ω is in every Sobolev space $H^s(\Omega^{2k}(L_x))$ and the family of continuos restriction morphisms on submanifolds of codimension 1, $s > 1/2$, $H^s(L_x) \longrightarrow H^{s-1/2}(\partial L_x^0) \hookrightarrow L^2(\partial L_x^0 \times \{t\})$ gives $(\partial L_x^0 \times t = \partial L_x^0)$ a family of continuous mappings

$$q[t]_x^{2k} : \mathcal{H}^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow L^2(\Lambda^{2k} T^* \partial L_x^0)$$

with $q[0]_x^{2k} = q_x^{2k} \circ r_x^{2k}$. Now the manifolds $\partial L_x^0 \times [0,\infty)$ and $\partial L_x^0 \times [t,\infty)$ are all isometric (choose the most simple family of is. $\phi_t(x) = x + t$) then, since the sequence of restrictions ω_t to $\partial L_x^0 \times [t,\infty)$ have all Sobolev norms going to zero the sequence $q[t]_x^{2k}(\omega)$ goes to zero in $L^2(\partial L_x^0)$ with $t \longrightarrow \infty$). More precisely $q[t]_x^{2k}\omega = \omega(t) = \omega_{t|\partial L_x^0 \times t} = q[0]_x^{2k}\phi_t^*\omega_t$ and $\phi_t^*\omega_t \longrightarrow 0$ in H^s, $s > 1/2$. Now we declare that all the forms $q[t]_x^{2k}(\omega)$ represent the same class in the reduced L^2 cohomology of the boundary. In fact on the cylinder $\omega = \omega_1(r) + \omega_2(r) \wedge dr$ with $\omega_{1,2} \in L^2([0,\infty), L^2(\Lambda^{2k} T^* \partial L_x^0))$, since ω is closed

$$d\omega = 0 = d_\partial \omega_1(r) \pm \frac{\partial \omega_1(r)}{\partial r} \wedge dr + d_\partial \omega_2(r) \wedge dr \underbrace{\Longrightarrow}_{\text{contraction}} \pm \frac{\partial \omega_1(r)}{\partial r} = d_\partial \omega_2(r).$$

Integrating this last equation $\omega_1(t) - \omega_1(0) = \pm d\Big(\int_0^t \omega_2(r)dr\Big)$ since the term $\omega_1(t)$ is the pullback of ω to $\partial L_x^0 \times t$,

$$q[t]_x^{2k}(\omega) - q[0]_x^{2k}(\omega) = \pm d\Big(\int_0^t \omega_2(r)dr\Big).$$

Since $q[t]_x^{2k}\omega \xrightarrow{L^2} 0$ the proof is concluded if we show that $\int_0^t \omega_2(r)dr$ is an L^2–form. Now since $\omega_{1,2}$ are L^2 functions on $[0,\infty]$ with values L^2 forms on the boundary we can write the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality on compact pieces (use the constant function 1)

$$\begin{aligned} |(\omega_2(r), 1)_{L^2([0,t];L^2(\Lambda T^*\partial L_x^0))}|^2 = \Big|\int_0^t \omega_2(r)dr\Big| &\leq \int_0^t 1^2 dr \cdot \int_0^t \|\omega_2(r)\|^2_{L^2(\partial L_x^0)} dr \\ &\leq t \cdot \int_0^t \|\omega_2(r)\|^2_{L^2(\partial L_x^0)} dr. \end{aligned}$$

□

By definition of the algebra of intert. operators $q_x^{2k} \circ r_x^{2k} = 0\, \forall x \in \partial X_0 \Longrightarrow \overline{\operatorname{range} r_x^{2k}} \subset \ker q_x^2 k$ then

$$\overline{\ker q^{2k}} \cdot \overline{\operatorname{range} r^{2k}} = \overline{\operatorname{range} i^{2k}} \cdot \overline{\operatorname{range} r^2 k} = \overline{\operatorname{range} r^{2k}} \in \operatorname{End}_{\Lambda, \underline{\mathcal{R}_0}} \Big[H_{dR,(2)}(X_0) \Big]$$

Now v.n. dimentions comes in play in a fundamental way. Consider the field of unbounded boundary differentials $d_x : L^2(\Omega^{2k-1}\partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{2k-1}\partial L_x^0)$ exactly as in [58] (and essentially by elliptic regularity and the fact trace=trace on the boundary foliation) they define a left Fredholm affiliated operator so the image of the field of the spectral projection $\chi_{(0,\gamma]}(\delta d)$ has dimension tending to zero for $\gamma \to 0$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ define the following field of subspaces,

$$E_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} := \operatorname{range}(d \circ \chi_{(\gamma,\infty)}(\delta d)) \subset L^2(\Omega^{2k}\partial L_x^0).$$

Properties of E_ϵ^{2k}

1. it is measurable, in fact is obtained by functional calculus from a natural Borel family.
2. It has codimension less that ϵ in $\overline{\operatorname{range}(d)}$ in fact $d \circ \chi_{(-\infty,0]}(\delta d) = 0$.
3. It is closed, because the restriction of δd to the subspace corresponding to $(0, \infty)$ satisfies $\delta d \geq \gamma$ than is invertible (this automatically seen using the polar decomposition).

Now we have to invoke the leafwise Hodge decomposition with (Neumann) boundary condition,

$$L^2(\Omega^{2k-1}(L_x^0)) = \overline{\operatorname{range} d^{2k-2}} \oplus \overline{\operatorname{range} \delta^{2k-2}_{|\{\omega_{|\partial}=0\}}} \oplus \ker \Delta^{2k}_{|\{(*\omega)_{|\partial}=0=(\delta\omega)_{|\partial}\}}. \tag{111}$$

The methods of Schick [85] surely applies to the generic leaf L_x^0 in fact this is bounded geometry and has a collar so the fact its boundary has infinite connected components (complete in the induced metric) plays no role. So the space $H^{2k}_{(2),dR}(L_x^0)$ can be canonically identified with the third addendum in (111) and pull back to the boundary gives a well defined measurable [26] family of (uniformely) bounded mappings $\beta_x^{2k} : H^{2k}_{(2),dR}(L_x^0) \longrightarrow L^2(\Omega^{2k}(\partial L_x^0))$. Define, by pull–back the following measurable field of closed subspaces

$$K^{2k}_{\epsilon,x} \subset H^{2k}_{(2),dR}(L_x^0).$$

Properties of $K^{2k}_{\epsilon,x}$:

1. $K^{2k}_{\epsilon,x} \subset H^{2k}_{(2),dR}(L_x^0)$
2. $K^{2k}_{\epsilon,x} \subset (\beta_x^{2k})^{-1}(\overline{\operatorname{range} d_\partial})$
3. The field $K^{2k}_{\epsilon,x}$ defines a projection having codimension in $\ker q^{2k}$ that's less than ϵ.

Then there's another density lemma in [60] (Lemma 3.16) stating another property,

$$K^{2k}_\epsilon \subset \operatorname{range}(r_x^{2k} : \mathcal{H}_2^{2k}(L_x) \longrightarrow \overline{\operatorname{range} i^{2k}}).$$

All of this properties certainly say that (109) is true (by normality of the trace we can reach $\overline{\operatorname{range}(i^{2k})}$ with a family of subprojections whose codimension tends to zero).

2.
Again following [60], $q[0]^{2k}$ (notation of the proof of Lemma 10.7.4) defines a bounded family of mappings from $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{(2)}(L_x)$ to $\overline{\operatorname{range} d_\partial}$. So let $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{\epsilon,x} \subset \mathcal{H}^{2k}_{(2)}(L_x)$ be as before the inverse image of $E^{2k}_{\epsilon,x}$. Since we are using harmonic forms the pull–back is (uniformly) bounded in the L^2 norm so $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{\epsilon,x}$ is a field of closed subspaces giving projection of codimension in $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{(2)}(X)$ not greater than ϵ. Now if

$$L^{2k}_{\epsilon,x} \subset \overline{\operatorname{range} i_x^{2k}}$$

is the closure of the image of $L^{2k}_{\epsilon,x}$ under the mapping $r_x^{2k} : \mathcal{H}^{2k}_{(2)}(L_x) \longrightarrow \overline{\operatorname{range} i_x^{2k}}$, its codimension into $\overline{\operatorname{range} i^{2k}}$ is less than ϵ exactly because of (109) since the codimension of $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_\epsilon$ in $\mathcal{H}^{2k}_{(2)}(X)$ is less than ϵ.
The leafwise intersection form

$$s_x^0 : H^{2k}_{(2)}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \times H^{2k}_{(2)}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

---

[26] inverse image of a measurable field of subspaces by a unif. bounded measurable family of bounded operators is measurable, one can split the domain space as $\operatorname{Ker} \oplus \operatorname{Ker}^\perp$ and apply the well known fact that inverses of isom. are measurable [31]

descends into a pairing on $\overline{\operatorname{range} i_x^{2k}}$ which restricts to a pairing

$$\eta_x^0 : L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \times L_{\epsilon,x}^{2k} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

But the codimension of $L_\epsilon^{2k} \subset \overline{\operatorname{range} i^{2k}}$ is less than ϵ one gets

$$|\operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(s^0) - \operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(\eta)| \leq \epsilon,$$

remember that $\operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(s^0) = \sigma_{\Lambda,dR}(X_0, \partial X_0)$.
Now it's a quite amazing computation performed by Luck and Schick [60] that the leafwise Hodge intersection form we called $s_x^\infty : \mathcal{H}_{(2)}(L_x) \times \mathcal{H}_{(2)}(L_x) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ descends to a pairing on each $\mathcal{H}_{\epsilon,x}^{2k}$ and in turn to exactly the pairing η_x^0 defined above. Again since the codimension of $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon^{2k}$ in $\mathcal{H}_{(2)}^{2k}(X)$ is $\leq \epsilon$ we get $|\operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(s^\infty) - \operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(\eta^0)| \leq \epsilon$ then

$$|\operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(s^\infty) - \operatorname{sign}_\Lambda(s^0)| \leq 2\epsilon.$$

The theorem is proved since ϵ is arbitrary.

REMARK — On the assumption of the complete transversal contained into the boundary. The assumption Saturation$(\partial X_0) = X_0$ is really simply avoidable in fact one can write the sequence

$$\begin{tikzcd} 0 \arrow[r] & A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0, \partial L_x^0) \arrow[r, "i"] & A_x^{k-1}(L_x^0) \arrow[r, "r"] & A_x^{k-1}(\partial L_x^0) \arrow[r] & 0 \end{tikzcd}$$

for x also in the interior but the last arrow is null for $\partial L_x^0 = 0$ so everything works in the exactly same way.

□

A Analysis on Manifolds with bounded geometry

Hereafter we review some essential results about differential operators, and the Dirac one in particular, on manifolds with bounded geometry. This theory was developed by J. Roe [79, 80, 81], M. Shubin [84] and J. Lott [54] among others.

Let M be an oriented Riemannian manifold of bounded geometry, by definition,

1. the injectivity radius of M, $\mathrm{inj}(M)$, defined as the infimum on M of radii of regular geodesic balls is finite.
2. The Riemann curvature tensor is uniformly bounded with every covariant derivative.

Definition A.87 — For an vector bundle to be of bounded geometry will mean that it is given a connection with uniformly bounded curvature together with every covariant derivative.

Natural examples are, compact manifolds, Galois covering of compact manifolds, the interior of a compact manifold with boundary equipped with a b–metric and finally leaves of a compact foliated manifold. An obvious but important property is that compact perturbations, i.e. connected sum preserve bounded geometry. Note that a non–compact manifold with bounded geometry has infinite volume. Directly from the definition one finds that if $\dim(M) = n$

there exists a positive number r such that the eclidean ball $B(0, r) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is the domain of exponential coordinates for every point in M. The Christoffel symbols of M regarded as a family of smooth functions depending on i, j, k and points m in B are a bounded subset of the Fréchet space $C^\infty(B)$. These geodetic balls can be used also to trivialize bundles by parallel traslation along geodesic rays of a fixed orthonormal basis at the center. Such frames are called *synchronous*. With a "*good coordinate ball*" one refers to this situation.

We shall consider till the end of this section Clifford modules of bounded geometry with $\mathbb{Z}_2$ graduated structure denoted generally by S and call D the associated Dirac operator.

Definition A.88 —

1. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$ the Sobolev space of sections of $H^k(S)$ is the completion of $C_c^\infty(S)$ under the norm
$$\|s\|_k = (\|s\|^2_{L^2} + \|\nabla s\|^2_{L^2} + \cdots \|\nabla^k s\|^2_{L^2})^{1/2}.$$
2. For negative k, $H^k(S)$ is the dual space of $H^{-k}(S)$ regarded as a distributional sections space.
3. Put $H^\infty(S) = \bigcap_k H^k(S)$ equipped with its natural Fréchet topology, $H^\infty(S) = \bigcup H^k(S)$ with the weak topology that it inherits as as the dual of $H^\infty(S)$.

Definition A.89 —

1. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$, the uniform C^r space is the Banach space of all C^r sections s of S such that the norm
$$|||s|||_r = \sup \big\{ |\nabla_{v_1} \cdots \nabla_{v_r} s(m)| \big\}$$
is finite, supremum taken over points $m \in M$ and collections $\{v_1, ..., v_q, 0 \leq q \leq r\}$ of unit vectors at m.

2. Also, $UC^\infty(S)$ is the Fréchet space $\bigcap_r UC^r(S)$.

The algebra of differential operators $\mathrm{Diff}^*(M,S)$ acting on S contains the subalgebra $\mathrm{UDiff}^*(M,S)$ of *uniform differential operators* generated by the uniform space $UC^\infty(\mathrm{End}(S))$ together with covariant derivatives ∇^S_X (as differential operators) along uniform vector fields $X \in UC^\infty(TM)$.

It turns out that for a differential operator to be uniformly elliptic is necessary and sufficient to have every derivative (also 0 order of course) of its symbol uniformly bounded on every good coordinate ball. A k–order uniform differential operator naturally defines continuous mappings, $H^r(M,S) \longrightarrow H^{r-k}(M,S)$ and $UC^l(M,S) \longrightarrow UC^{l-k}(M,S)$.

DEFINITION A.90 — An uniform differential operator $P \in \mathrm{UDiff}^*(M,S)$ is uniformly elliptic if its principal symbol

$$\sigma_{\mathrm{pr}}(P) \in \mathrm{UC}(T^*M, \pi^*(\mathrm{End}(S)))$$

has an uniform inverse in an ϵ–neightborhood of the zero section in T^*M.

THEOREM A.90 — (uniform Gårding's inequality) For an uniformly elliptic operator $T \in \mathrm{UDiff}^k(M,S)$, for every l there exists a positive constant $C(l)$ such that

$$\|s\|_{H^{s+k}} \leq C(l)\{\|s\|_{H^s} + \|Ps\|_{H^s}\}, \tag{112}$$

for every $s \in C^\infty_c(M,S)$.

PROOF— A straightforward generalization of compact case. □

Here a list of properties

In this framework the Sobolev embedding theorem reads as follows,

THEOREM A.90 — For $k, s \in \mathbb{N}$, $s > k + (\dim(M))/2$ There is a continuous inclusion $H^s(M,S) \longrightarrow UC^k(M,S)$ hence also a continuous inclusion of Fréchet spaces

$$H^\infty(S) \longrightarrow UC^\infty(S)$$

.

PROOF— As observed by J. Roe, this is an adaption of the standard compact case, in fact thanks to bounded geometry assumption the family of local Sobolev constant on good balls is bounded. □

Now by Schwartz kernel theorem a continuous linear operator[27] $T : C^\infty_c(M,S) \longrightarrow C^{-\infty}(M,s)$ is univocally represented by its Schwartz kernel, the unique distribution–section $K_T \in C^{-\infty}(M \times M, \mathrm{END}(S) \otimes \mathrm{Pr}_1^*\Omega(M))$ satisfying the distributional equation

$$\langle K_T u, v\rangle = \langle K_T, v \boxtimes u\rangle$$

---

[27] If T is not a pseudo–differential operator it is customary to require that it respects all the connected components of M.

for every $u, v \in C_c^\infty(M, S)$. Here the *big endomorphism bundle* $\mathrm{END}(S) \longrightarrow M \times M$ has fiber $\mathrm{Hom}(S_x, S_y)$ over (x, y). the following is a group of definitions.

Definitions A.91 —

1. We say that T has order $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ if it extends to an operator in $B(H^s(M, S), H^{s-k}(M, s))$ for every s.
2. The space of k–order operators is denoted by $\mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$. with seminorms given by $B(H^s(M, S), H^{s-k}(M, s))$.
3. The space $\mathrm{Op}^{-\infty}(M, S) = \bigcap_{k<0} \mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$ is called the space of uniformly smoothig operators. In fact we shall see it is the space of operators with uniformly smooth kernels.
4. An element $T \in \mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$, $k \geq 1$ is called elliptic if it satisfies the uniform Gårding inequality (112).

Below a list of properties that can be found in the papers cited at the beginning.

Proposition A.92 —

- Ellipticity is stable under order 0 perturbations, if $T \in \mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$ elliptic and $Q \in \mathrm{Op}^0(M, S)$ then $T + Q$ is elliptic.
- If $\in \mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$ is elliptic and formally self–adjoint then every its spectral projection belongs to $\mathrm{Op}^0(M, s)$.
- It follows from the completeness of M that an elliptic and formally self–adjoint element $T \in \mathrm{Op}^k(M, S)$ ($k \geq 1$ as required by the definition of elliptic element) is essentially selfadjoint on $L^2(M, S)$.

  If T denotes its closure also one finds that $\mathrm{dom}(T) = H^k(M, S)$. In particular this is true for the Dirac operator D.

A.1 Spectral functions of elliptic operators

Last theorem says that an uniformly elliptic operator on a manifold with bounded geometry is essentially self–adjoint. We need some considerations about spectral functions of T. Let

$$RB(\mathbb{R}) := \{f : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C},\ \text{Borel};\quad |(1 + x^2)^{k/2} f(x)|_\infty < \infty \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}\}$$

be the space of rapidly decreasing Borel functions with Fréchet structure induce by the seminorms $|(1 + x^2)^{k/2} \cdot |_\infty$
Let $RC(\mathbb{R})$ denote the closed subspace of continuous functions.

Proposition A.93 — For an elliptic element T and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and rapid Borel functions f, $T^l f(T)$ is bounded in L^2 and the following Gårding inequality holds true,

$$\|f(T)\psi\|_{H^l} \leq C(l) \sum_{i=0}^{l} \|T^i f(T)\psi\|_{L^2} \leq C(l)\|\psi\|_{L^2} \sum_{i=0}^{l} |x^i f|_\infty \qquad (113)$$

for every $\psi \in C_c^\infty(M,S)$. Suppose now, by simplicity of writing that T has order 1, making use of the duality

$$(H^s)^* = H^{-s}$$

one finds, for $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$, $l \geq k$,

$$\|f(T)\psi\|_{H^l} \leq C(l,k) \sum_{i=0}^{l-k} \|T^i f(T)\psi\|_{H^k} \leq C(l,k)\|\psi\|_{H^k} \sum_{i=0}^{l-k} |x^i f|_\infty. \tag{114}$$

PROOF— Observe first that the operator $T^l f(T)$ is the spectral function of T corresponding to the function $x^l f(x)$ on $\mathbb{R}$ hence is bounded. Again, since f is bounded no problem here in commuting relations, in particular $T^l f(T) = f(T)T^l$ (equality in the sense of unbounded operators) in particular $f(T) : L^2 \longrightarrow H^{l+k}$. Now from Gårding's inequality for T,

$$\|f(T)\psi\|_{H^l} \leq C(l) \sum_{i=0}^{l} \|T^i f(T)\psi\|_{L^2} \leq C(l)\|\psi\|_{L^2} \sum_{i=0}^{l} |x^i f|_\infty.$$

Inequality (114) follows at once from the first one (113) in fact the first step is to consider the transpose of $T^l f(T) : H^{-l} \longrightarrow H^{-k}$ while the second step is based on our very dual definition of Sobolev space of order negative. □

Hence, we get continuity of the functional calculus $RB(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow B(H^l(M,S), H^k(M,S))$ for each l, k then continuity of $RB(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Op}^{-\infty}(M,S)$. With a little work, using Sobolev embedding one can prove the following theorem.

THEOREM A.93 — Let $T \in \mathrm{Op}^k(M,S)$ uniformly elliptic and formally selfadjoint.

- If $L = [n/2+1]$, $n = \dim M$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ then the *kernel mapping*

  $$\mathrm{Op}^{-2L-l}(M,S) \longrightarrow UC^l(M \times M, \mathrm{END}(S) \otimes \mathrm{Pr}_1^*\Omega(M)), T \longmapsto K_T,$$

  is continuous.

- For $f \in RB(\mathbb{R})$ the kernel of $f(T)$ is uniformly smoothing,

  $$K_T \in UC^\infty(M \times M, \mathrm{END}(S) \otimes \mathrm{Pr}_1^*\Omega(M)).$$

  and the kernel mapping $RB(\mathbb{R}) \longrightarrow UC^\infty(M \times M, \mathrm{END}(S) \otimes \mathrm{Pr}_1^*\Omega(M))$ is continuous.

REMARK — Combining A.19, page 108 and **??** we see that every spectral projection Π_A of the Dirac operator obtained by a bounded Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ is represented by a uniformly smoothing kernel hence is locally traceable (in the usual sense on $L^2(M,S)$ w.r.t the Abelian Von Neumann algebra $L^\infty(M)$). This means that for every Borel set $B \subset M$ with compact closure the operator $\chi_B \Pi_A \chi_B$ is trace class, one gets a Radon measure $B \longmapsto \mathrm{trace}\, \chi_B \Pi_A \chi_B$ called the local trace of Π_A.

A.2 Some computations on Clifford algebras

Let $\mathbb{C}l(k)$ the (complex) Clifford algebra over the euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^k$, with generators $\mathbf{c}_1, \dots, \mathbf{c}_k$ and relations ($\mathbf{c}_j$ orthonormal basis)

$$\mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{c}_j + \mathbf{c}_j\mathbf{c}_i = -2\delta_{ij}.$$

The algebra $\mathbb{C}l(k)$ is $\mathbb{Z}_2$-graded: $\mathbb{C}l(k) = \mathbb{C}l^+(k) \oplus \mathbb{C}l^-(k)$, being $\mathbb{C}l^+(k)$ the subalgebra spanned by products of even sets of generators.
The map $\mathbf{c}_i \longmapsto \mathbf{c}_i\mathbf{c}_{k+1}$ defines an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}l(k) \overset{\sim}{\to} \mathbb{C}l^+(k+1)$.
The volume element $\tau_k := i^{[(k+1)/2]}\mathbf{c}_1 \dots \mathbf{c}_k \in \mathbb{C}l(k)$ satisfies $\tau_k^2 = 1$ and thus induces a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-grading on each representation of $\mathbb{C}l(k)$. Due to the fact

$$\tau_k\mathbf{c} = -(-1)^k\mathbf{c}\tau_k$$

for $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^k \subset \mathbb{C}l(k)$ this induced grading is trivial if k is odd. $\mathbb{C}l(2l)$ has a unique irreducible representation, called its spinor space and we denote it by $S(2l)$. Its dimension is $\dim S(2l) = 2^l$. Decomposing into the ±1-Eigenspaces of τ_{2l} we write $S(2l) = S^+(2l) \oplus S^-(2l)$. Via the identification $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \cong \mathbb{C}l^+(2l)$ the spaces $S^+(2l)$, $S^-(2l)$ are non-equivalent irreducible representations of $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1)$, which can be considered as being isomorphic representations of $\mathbb{C}l(2l-2) \cong \mathbb{C}l^+(2l-1)$ via the map $S^+(2l) \overset{c_{2l}}{\to} S^-(2l)$. This of course is then just the representation $S(2l-2)$ of $\mathbb{C}l(2l-2)$.
Notation: for $S^{\pm}(2l)$ we also write $S^{\pm}(2l-1)$ when these spaces are seen as representations of $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \arrow[r, leftrightarrow] & \mathbb{C}l^+(2l) \arrow[r, leftrightarrow] & \mathrm{End}^+(S^+(2l) \bigoplus S^-(2l)) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & \mathrm{End}(S^{\pm}(2l)) =: \mathrm{End}(S^{\pm}(2l-1))\ .
\end{tikzcd}$$

It is easily seen that $\mathbb{C}l(2l)$ acts injectively on $S(2l)$. Comparison of dimensions then yields $\mathbb{C}(2l) \cong \mathrm{End}(S(2l))$, and, using $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \cong \mathbb{C}l^+(2l)$ also

$$\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \cong \mathbb{C}l^+(2l) \cong \mathrm{End}^+(S(2l)).$$

The identification $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \longrightarrow \mathrm{End}(S^{\pm}(2l-1))$ maps τ_{2l-1} to ±1 and one can show that the null space is $(1 \mp \tau_{2l-1})\mathbb{C}(2l-1)$.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{End}(S^+(2l) \bigoplus S^-(2l)) \arrow[r, leftrightarrow] & \mathbb{C}l(2l) = & \underbrace{\mathbb{C}l^+(2l)} \arrow[dll, leftrightarrow] & \bigoplus & \mathbb{C}l^-(2l) \\
\overbrace{\mathbb{C}l(2l-1)} = & \underbrace{\mathbb{C}l^+(2l-1)} \arrow[dl, leftrightarrow] & \bigoplus & \mathbb{C}l^-(2l-1) & \\
\overbrace{\mathbb{C}l(2l-2)} & & & &
\end{tikzcd}$$

The traces $\mathrm{tr}^{\pm}$ on $\mathrm{End}(S^{\pm}(2l-1))$ and the graded trace str on $\mathrm{End}(S(2l))$ then induce traces on $\mathbb{C}(2l-1)$ and $\mathbb{C}(2l)$. On elements of the form $\mathbf{c}_I := \mathbf{c}_{i1} \dots \mathbf{c}_{i|I|}$ where $I = \{i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_{|I|}\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}$ these can be computed as follows

Lemma A.94 —

(a) In $\mathbb{C}l(2l)$ we have $\mathrm{str}(\tau_{2l}) = 2^l$ and $\mathrm{str}(1) = \mathrm{str}(\mathbf{c}_I) = 0$ for $I \neq \{1, \dots, k\}$.

(b) In $\mathbb{C}l(2l-1)$ we have $\mathrm{str}(\tau_{2l-1}) = -\mathrm{tr}^{-}(\tau_{2l-1}) = \mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(1) = 2^{l-1}$ and for $I \neq \{1,\dots,k\}$ we have $\mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(\mathbf{c}_1) = 0$.

On $(\mathbb{C}l(2l-1) - \mathbb{C}) \subset \mathbb{C}l(2l)$ therefore $\mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(\bullet) = \mp\frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{str}(\mathbf{c}_{2l}\bullet)$ and on $\mathbb{C}l(2l) \subset \mathbb{C}l(2l+1)$ we have $\mathrm{str}(\bullet) = \pm i\,\mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(\mathbf{c}_{2l+1}\bullet)$

PROOF— Cf. [10], Proposition 3.21 □

The map $S^{+}(2l) \xrightarrow{c_{2l}} S^{-}(2l)$ gives an identification $S(2l) \cong S^{\pm}(2l-1) \oplus S^{\pm}(2l-1)$. In this representation, $\mathbb{C}l(2l)$ acts on $S(2l)$ as follows

$$\mathbf{c}_i \in \mathbb{C}l(2l-1) \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \pm\mathbf{c}_i \\ \pm\mathbf{c}_i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{c}_{2l} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{and } \mathrm{str}\begin{pmatrix} \phi_1 & \phi_2 \\ \phi_3 & \phi_4 \end{pmatrix} = \mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(\phi_1) - \mathrm{tr}^{\pm}(\phi_4)$$

References

[1] Robert Lauter, Victor Nistor, Bernd Ammann On the geometry of Riemannian manifolds with a Lie structure at infinity Documenta Mathematica, Vol. 11 (2006), 161-206 (electronic) ftp://ftp.math.uni-hamburg.de/pub/unihh/math/papers/hbm/hbm2002146.ps.gz

[2] M. F. Atiyah. Elliptic operators, discrete groups and von Neumann algebras. In *Colloque "Analyse et Topologie" en l'Honneur de Henri Cartan (Orsay, 1974)*, pages 43–72. Astérisque, No. 32–33. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1976.

[3] M. F. Atiyah., R. Bott, and V. K. Patodi. On the heat equation and the index theorem Invent. Math. (19), 279–330 1973. errata, No. ibid. (28) 277–280 1975.

[4] M. F. Atiyah., R. Bott. The index theorem for manifolds with boundary. Differential analysis, Bombay colloquium (Oxford 1964).

[5] M. F. Atiyah, V. K. Patodi, and I. M. Singer. Spectral asymmetry and Riemannian geometry. I. *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 77:43–69, 1975.

[6] M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer. The index of elliptic operators. I. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 87:484–530, 1968.

[7] M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer. The index of elliptic operators. III. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 87:546–604, 1968.

[8] M. F. Atiyah and I. M. Singer. The index of elliptic operators. IV. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 93:119–138, 1971.

[9] M.-T. Benameur & A.L. Carey & J. Phillips & A. Rennie & F.A. Sukochev & K.P. Wojciechowski. An analytic approach to spectral flow in von Neumann algebras, *Analysis, Geometry and Topology of Elliptic Operators*, World Sci. Publ., 297–352, 2007.

[10] Nicole Berline, Ezra Getzler, and Michèle Vergne. *Heat kernels and Dirac operators*, volume 298 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[11] Jean-Michel Bismut. The Atiyah-Singer index theorem for families of Dirac operators: two heat equation proofs. *Invent. Math.*, 83(1):91–151, 1985.

[12] Jean-Michel Bismut and Jeff Cheeger. Remarks on the index theorem for families of Dirac operators on manifolds with boundary. In *Differential geometry*, volume 52 of *Pitman Monogr. Surveys Pure Appl. Math.*, pages 59–83. Longman Sci. Tech., Harlow, 1991.

[13] Jean-Michel Bismut and D. S. Freed. The Analysis of elliptic families. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, volume 107, 103–163. 1986.

[14] Jean-Michel Bismut and John Lott. Flat vector bundles, direct images and higher real analytic torsion. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 8(2):291–363, 1995.

[15] Boris Botvinnik and Peter B. Gilkey The eta invariant and metrics of positive scalar curvature. Math. Ann. 302 (1995), 507-517

[16] Manfred Breuer Fredholm theories on Von Neumann algebras I *Math. Ann.* 178, 243–254, 1968.

[17] Manfred Breuer Fredholm theories on Von Neumann algebras II *Math. Ann.* 180, 313–325. 1969.

[18] J. Brüning and M. Lesch. Hilbert complexes *J Functional Analysis* 108, 88-132 (1992)

[19] Ulrich Bunke. A K–theoretic relative index theorem and Callias–Type Dirac operators, *Math. Ann.*, 303:241–279, 1995.

[20] A.L. Carey & J. Phillips Unbounded Fredholm modules and spectral flow. *Can. J. Math* 50(4):673–718 1998

[21] A.L. Carey & J. Phillips & A. Rennie & F.A. Sukochev "The local index formula in semifinite von Neumann algebras II: the even case". *Adv. Math.* 202:517–554 2006

[22] Jeff Cheeger and Mikhael Gromov. Bounds on the von Neumann dimension of L^2-cohomology and the Gauss-Bonnet theorem for open manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 21(1):1–34, 1985.

[23] Jeff Cheeger, Mikhail Gromov, and Michael Taylor. Finite propagation speed, kernel estimates for functions of the Laplace operator, and the geometry of complete Riemannian manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.*, 17(1):15–53, 1982.

[24] P. R. Chernoff Essential self–adjointness of powers of generators of hyperbolic equations. *J. Functional Analysis.*, 12:401–414, 1973.

[25] A. Connes and G. Skandalis. The longitudinal index theorem for foliations. *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.*, 20(6):1139–1183, 1984.

[26] Alain Connes. Sur la théorie non commutative de l'intégration. In *Algèbres d'opérateurs (Sém., Les Plans-sur-Bex, 1978)*, volume 725 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 19–143. Springer, Berlin, 1979.

[27] Alain Connes. *Noncommutative geometry.* Academic Press Inc., San Diego, CA, 1994.

[28] Alain. Connes Nombres de Betti l^2 et facteurs de type II1 (d'après D. Gaboriau et S. Popa), *Astérisque* 294 (2004), p. 321333

[29] Claire Anantharaman-Denlaroche and Jean Renault *Amenable Groupoids.* Monographies de L'Enseignement MathŐmatique [Monographs of L'Enseignement MathŐmatique], Geneva 36 (2000) 196 pp

[30] J. Dieudonne. Treatise on modern analysis. Vol 10-VII Academic Press, New York, 1988.

[31] J. Dixmier. Von Neumann algebras. North Holland, Amsterdam, 1988.

[32] N. Dunford and J. Schwartz Linear operators part 2, Spectral theory. Interscience, New York, 1963

[33] Mostafa Esfahani Zadeh *An Index Theorem on foliated manifolds with Boundary* Preprint

[34] Ezra Getzler. Cyclic homology and the Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem. In *Index theory and operator algebras (Boulder, CO, 1991)*, volume 148 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 19–45. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993.

[35] Peter Gilkey Invariance Theory and the Atiyah Singer index theorem. Electronic reprint ľ 1996 Peter B. Gilkey, http://www.emis.de/monographs/gilkey/ Paper version originally published by Publish or Perish Inc., USA, 1984 Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 84-061166 ISBN 0-914098-20-9

[36] Alexander Gorokhovsky and John Lott. Local index theorem over foliation groupoids. *to be appeared in Jour of Kerell.*

[37] Daniel Grieser. Basics of the b-calculus. In *Approaches to singular analysis (Berlin, 1999)*, volume 125 of *Oper. Theory Adv. Appl.*, pages 30–84. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2001.

[38] James Heitsch and Conor Lazarov. Homotopy invariance of foliation Betti numbers, In Invent. Math, 104 pages 321–347 1991.

[39] Lars Hörmander. Analysis of linear partial differential operators III. *Springer*, 1983.

[40] Eric Leichtnam and Paolo Piazza Cut-and-paste on foliated bundles. Spectral geometry of manifolds with boundary and decomposition of manifolds, 151–192, Contemp. Math., 366, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.

[41] Mikhael Gromov. Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (53):53–73, 1981.

[42] André. Haefliger. Varietés feuilletés. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa (16), 367Ð397, 1962

[43] P. de la Harpe and G. Skandalis. Déterminant associé à une trace sur une algébre de Banach. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), 34(1):241Ð260, 1984.

[44] D. Gaboriau Invariants l2 de relations d'équivalence et de groupes *Publ. math., Inst. Hautes Étud. Sci.* 95 no. 1 (2002), 93-150.

[45] Michel Hilsum Hilbert modules of foliated manifolds with boundary FOLIATIONS: GEOMETRY AND DYNAMICS Proceedings of the Euroworkshop Warsaw, Poland, 29 May - 9 June 2000

[46] Lars Hörmander. Pseudo–differential operators. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, (18):501–517, 1965.

[47] Yu. A. Kordyukov. Functional calculus for tangentially elliptic operators on foliated manifolds. *Analysis and Geometry of foliated Manifolds, Proceedings of the VII International Colloquim on Differential geometry, Santiago de Compostela, 1994.* Singapore World scientific, 1995, 113-136.

[48] Yu. A. Kordyukov. Noncommutative spectral geometry of Riemannian foliations. *Manuscripta Math.* 94:45–73 1997.

[49] H. Blaine Lawson, Jr. and Marie-Louise Michelsohn. *Spin geometry*, volume 38 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1989.

[50] Eric Leichtnam and Paolo Piazza. The b-pseudodifferential calculus on Galois coverings and a higher Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem. *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)*, (68):iv+121, 1997.

[51] Eric Leichtnam and Paolo Piazza Étale groupoids, eta invariants and index theory. J. Reine Angew. Math. 587 (2005), 169–233. 58J28 (19K56 58J22 58J42)

[52] Eric Leichtnam, John Lott and Paolo Piazza. On the homotopy invariance of higher signatures on manifolds with boundary. Journal of Differential Geometry, (54) 2000.

[53] Daniel Lenz, Norbert Peyerimhoff, and Ivan Veselińc. Groupoids, von Neumann algebras and the integrated density of states. Math. Phys. Anal. Geom. , 10(1):1Ð41, 2007

[54] John Lott. Higher eta-invariants. *K-Theory*, 6(3):191–233, 1992.

[55] John Lott, Wolfang Lü ck L^2-Topological invariants of 3-manifolds. *Invent. math.*, 120, 15–60 (1995)

[56] Paul Loya. Dirac operators, boundary value problems and the b–calculus *AMS Contemporary Math. Proceedings volume on Spectral Geometry of Manifolds with Boundary, edited by B. Booss-Bavnbek, G. Grubb and K. P. Wojciechowski,* 2005.

[57] Wolfang Luck, L^2 Invariants: Theory and applications to geometry and K–Theory Volume 44 of the Springer series "A series of Modern Surveys in Mathemathics"

[58] Wolfang Luck, Thomas Schick L^2–torsion of hyperbolic manifolds of finite volume. Geometric And Functional Analysis, Volume 9, Number 3 June, 1999

[59] James heitsch and Steven Hurder Secondary classes, Weil measures and the geometry of foliations. J. Differential Geom. 20 (1984), no. 2, 291–309; MR 86i:57032

[60] Wolfang Lück, Thomas Schick Various L^2–signatures and a topological L^2–signature theorem. High-dimensional manifold topology, 362–399, World Sci. Publishing, River Edge, NJ, 2003

[61] H. P. McKean, Jr. and I. M. Singer. Curvature and the eigenvalues of the Laplacian. *J. Differential Geometry*, 1(1):43–69, 1967.

[62] Richard B. Melrose. *The Atiyah-Patodi-Singer index theorem*, volume 4 of *Research Notes in Mathematics*. A K Peters Ltd., Wellesley, MA, 1993.

[63] Richard B. Melrose and Paolo Piazza. Families of Dirac operators, boundaries and the b-calculus. *J. Differential Geom.*, 46(1):99–180, 1997.

[64] J. Milnor. A note on curvature and fundamental group. *J. Differential Geometry*, 2:1–7, 1968.

[65] Calvin C. Moore and Claude Schochet. *Global analysis on foliated spaces*, volume 9 of *Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988. With appendices by S. Hurder, Moore, Schochet and Robert J. Zimmer.

[66] Werner Müller. On the L^2-index of Dirac operators on manifolds with corners of codimension two. I. *J. Differential Geom.*, 44(1):97–177, 1996.

[67] Victor Nistor, Alain Weinstein and Ping Xu. Pseudodifferential operators on differential groupoids, *Pacific J. of Math.*, 189(1):117–152, 1999.

[68] A. E. Nussbaum Reduction theory for unbounded closed operators in hilbert space, *Duke Math. Journal*, 31(1):33–44, 1964.

[69] R. S. Palais Seminar on the Atiyah Singer index theorem *Annals of mathematics*, study 57 Princeton university press, Princeton 1975.

[70] Goran Peric. Eta invariants of Dirac operators on foliated manifolds, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 334(2): 761–782. 1992

[71] Paolo Piazza, Thomas Schick. Bordism, Rho invariants and the Baum Connes conjecture. arXiv:math/0407388v2 Journal of Non-Commutative Geometry 1, 27-111 (2007)

[72] Paolo Piazza, Thomas Schick Groups with torsion, bordism and rho invariants. Pacific J. Math. 232 (2007), no. 2, 355–378.

[73] J.F. Plante. Foliations with measure preserving holonomy *Ann. of Math.*, 102:327-361, 1975.

[74] J. Phillips and I. Raeburn. An Index Theorem for Toeplitz Operators with Noncommutative Symbol Space, *J.Functional Analysis*, 120:239-263, 1994.

[75] Daniel Quillen. Superconnections and the Chern character. *Topology*, 24(1):89–95, 1985.

[76] Mohan Ramachandran. Von Neumann index theorems for manifolds with boundary. *J. Differential Geom.*, 38(2):315–349, 1993.

[77] M Reed and B. Simon Methods of Mathematical Physics IV. Academic Press, New York 1978.

[78] John Roe. Eta Functions and carachteristic classes. *notes of a course given at Oxford University*, 1988.

[79] John Roe. Elliptic operators, topology and asymptotic methods. *Pitman research notes in Mathematics*, 179 1988.

[80] John Roe. An index theorem on open manifolds I. *J. Differential Geom.*, (27) 1988. 87-113

[81] John Roe. An index theorem on open manifolds II. *J. Differential Geom.*, (27) 1988. 115-136

[82] Finite propagation speed and Connes' foliation algebra. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 102 (1987), no. 3, 459–466.

[83] David Ruelle and Dennis Sullivan. Currents, flows and diffeomorphisms. *Topology.*, 14 (4) 1988. 319-327.

[84] Mikhail Shubin Von Neumann algebras and L^2 techniques in geometry and topology www.mccme.ru/ium/postscript/f02/L2titlepages.ps.gz

[85] Thomas Schick, Analysis on boundary manifolds of bounded geometry, Hodge-de Rham isomorphism and L2-index theorem. Dissertation. Printed by Shaker Verlag, 1996. ISBN=3-8265-1969-8 http://www.uni-math.gwdg.de/schick/publ/dissschick.htm

[86] Thomas Schick, Analysis and Geometry of Boundary-Manifolds of Bounded Geometry. http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9810107.

[87] Thomas Schick, Boundary manifolds of bounded geometry. Math. Nachr. 223 (2001), 103–120.

[88] S.R. Simanca . Pseudodifferential operators. Pitman Researc Notes in Mathematics Series 1990.

[89] Masamichi Takesaki Theory of operator algebra I Springer Verlag

[90] N. Teleman. *The index of signature operators on Lipschitz manifolds.* Publ. Math. IHES, 58:39 78, 1983.

[91] N. Teleman. *The index theorem for topological manifolds.* Acta Math., 153(1-2):117 152, 1984.

[92] Jean Louis Tu. La conjecture de Novikov pour les feuilletages hyperboliques. *K-Theory*, 16(2):129–184, 1999.

[93] B. Vaillant. Indextheorie fur Uberlagerungen. Diplomarbeit, Universitat. Bonn, http://styx.math.uni-bonn.de/boris/diplom.html, 1997

[94] Stephane Vassout. *Feuilletage et résidu non commutatif longitudinal.* PhD thesis. Paris, 2001.